Class 281.9 S Sco 85 Book
General Theological Seminary Library
CHELSEA SQUARE, NEW YORK

Purchased from the fund bequeathed to the Seminary by
EUGENE AUGUSTUS HOFFMAN, D. D.
DEAN 1879-1902

THE EASTERN CHURCHES AND THE PAPACY

THE EASTERN CHURCHES AND THE PAPACY

by

The Rev. S. Herbert Scott
D.Phil., B.Litt. (Oxon), F.R.H.S.
Rector of Oddington

CENTRAL SEMINARY
LIBRARY
NEW YORK

LONDON: SHEED & WARD
31 PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.4

281.9 S
So 85

87275

First published - 1928

UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
LIBRARY
NEW YORK

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
THE STANHOPE PRESS, LTD.
ROCHESTER .. KENT

PARENTIBVS PIISSIMIS
PIVS FILIVS

CONTENTS

PART I

		PAGE
I	INTRODUCTORY	1
II	THE " PRIMACY " IN THE FIRST THREE CENTURIES	5
III	THE SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY	56
IV	THE COUNCIL OF NICÆA (325)	71

PART II

V	CONSTANTINE'S INTEREST IN THE CHURCH. THE BIRTH OF CÆSARO-PAPISM	89
VI	ATHANASIUS PATRIARCH OF ALEXANDRIA (328-373)	99
VII	THE MELETIAN SCHISM. ST. BASIL AND ST. JOHN CHRYSOSTOM	118
VIII	THE FIRST COUNCIL OF CONSTANTINOPLE (381) ..	136
IX	THE COUNCIL OF EPHESUS (431)	143
X	THE COUNCIL OF CHALCEDON (451). THE PAPACY AT CHALCEDON	189
XI	THE CONSEQUENCES OF CHALCEDON	207
XII	THE PAPACY IN THE TIME OF THE EMPEROR JUSTINIAN —THE FIFTH GENERAL COUNCIL (553)	226
XIII	THE MONOTHELITE CONTROVERSY AND THE SIXTH GENERAL COUNCIL—CONSTANTINOPLE III (680-681)	262
XIV	THE ICONOCLASTIC CONTROVERSY AND THE SEVENTH GENERAL COUNCIL (786)	289

CONTENTS

PART III

		PAGE
XV	PHOTIUS AND HIS SCHISM	315
XVI	THE VARYING TEACHING OF PHOTIUS ON "PETRINE" PREROGATIVES	344
XVII	SUMMARY—GENERAL REFLECTIONS AND CONCLUSIONS	350
	APPENDICES	
	I	381
	II	381
	III	382
	IV	382
	V	383
	VI	384
	VII	386
	VIII	386
	IX	388
	X	389
	XI	390
	XII	390
	XIII	391
	XIV	392
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	393
	INDEX	399

AUTHOR'S NOTE

This book, the Dissertation approved for a Research Doctorate Degree in the University of Oxford, treats of a subject not only of importance to students of history and theology, but one of the first practical interest to the ordinary educated layman, who, if his Latin and Greek are of less than the Shakespearean standard, may skim over the passages of both without losing the thread of the argument.

One outcome of the Great War (1914–1918), followed up as it was by the Revolution in Russia and by the persecution of the Russian Church, is the interest it has aroused throughout the world in the entire question of the relation of Eastern to Western Christendom.

In the following pages an attempt is made accurately to describe this relation prior to the Schism of the ninth century ; to show in particular how the Russian together with the thirteen other Eastern Orthodox Churches which look to the Patriarch of Constantinople as their titular head came to be estranged from the West ; and to investigate the reasons which led to the separation of Constantinople from Rome, and from the See of Rome, which hitherto had been recognised throughout the East as the Apostolic See and as the common centre of Christendom.

It should be said that the italics in the quotations are mine except where otherwise stated.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTORY

THE question we are proposing to answer is, What were the relations of the Eastern Churches to Rome before the schism of Photius? i.e. during roughly the first nine hundred years of the Church's existence.

In an investigation of this nature, the most satisfactory and the most logical plan is to divide the centuries concerned into clearly defined periods, each marked by its own peculiar circumstances and characteristics.

I shall therefore divide the book into three Parts dealing respectively with:

(1) The period from the foundation of the Church Catholic up to and including the Council of Nicæa, 325.
(2) The period from the year 330, the date of the founding of Constantinople, onwards to the passing of Rome under the protectorate of the Franks.
(3) The period covered by the career of Photius himself.

The Council of Nicæa, held under the first "Christian" emperor and convoked by him, definitely marks the close of the first Age of the Church.

From persecution the Church passes through toleration to the position of domination over, or first rank among, the religions of the empire. The first Œcumenical Council obviously forms the climax of this first period. The First Part of our enquiry, then, is naturally coterminous.

. . . . .

The Second Part is really the most important section of the book. It commences with the foundation of Constantinople, "New Rome," an event fraught with such tremendous consequences to the history of the Church.

This Part covers the centuries when the next six General Councils were held. It witnesses to the advancement more or

less rapid, but always constant and consistent, of Constantinople to the second place in the hierarchy of the Church.

. . . . .

The Third Part is more especially devoted to the activities, influence and policy of that powerful personality, Photius ; and to the circumstances of the outbreak of the schism destined to be made practically permanent by Michael Cerularius.

. . . . .

Now Part I, though not the chief section, has an importance all its own, and for this reason : the relations of the Eastern and Western Churches, *whatever they are, are, during that time, independent of any patronage or approval of emperors.* They are functioning for three hundred years before the empire becomes Christian. In fact it is of this period that Döllinger writes : " The popes were, even in the times of the Roman emperors, the guardians of the whole Church, exhorting and warning in all directions, disposing and judging, binding and loosing." [1]

But the Second Part, as I have said, is the main section, because it contains all the General Councils (with the exception of Nicæa) common to East and West. *And I base the weight of my conclusions mainly on the evidence of General Councils.*

For it is not so much what an individual " Eastern " Father or " Greek " Father says (though this is extremely important, as affording independent illustration, corroboration and confirmation) as what the Universal Church, " the Undivided Church," in her Supreme Councils, the meetings of her representatives in common, says, enacts, inscribes, pre-supposes, or implies.

The discussion must revolve chiefly round the Seven Œcumenical Councils, because they are received and accepted by the Orthodox East and the West alike.

This would have to be the method, even though one did not believe (as both the Easterns and the Westerns do believe) that the Œcumenical Councils are, at any rate in their dogmatic decrees, " infallible." A man approaching the Seven General Councils purely as a historian is bound to recognise in these Councils the high-water mark of consensus of East and West.

[1] Döllinger, *The Church and the Churches*, London 1862, p. 42. cf. Von Hügel's *Selected Letters*, p. 301 (Ed. Bernard Holland, 1927). " Another point which Catholicism has still quite alive, and which *Church* Protestantism has strangely little of, is the sense that religion is not a department of the civil service, as the late Lord Houghton so touchingly used to say it is. In the midst of their absorption as to whether Romanism is, or is not, loyal to the State, most Protestants have been curiously without the sense that Christianity was for the first three centuries an outlawed religion."

cf. also a very just comment in a recent brochure, *The Papacy*, by A. L. Maycock (London 1927), pp. 20–21.

Without giving a thought to the question of "infallibility," it will be obvious to him that he will find in these Seven Councils the highest common factor of the agreement of Orthodox and Westerns.

The Acts of the Councils, the settings, details, events, presuppositions and decisions of these gatherings representative of the whole Church, and the writings of those who took part in them, will therefore be necessarily of the first importance. Next will come appeals of Easterns to the Roman pope—what the Easterns say of Peter and Rome and the papacy. These will be of far more weight and consideration than what the popes say of themselves; though one would not go so far as to apply (in this connection) the old adage "self-praise is no recommendation." For what a pope says to an Eastern of himself and his office is of significance and importance if it is not contested or controverted or contradicted by the Eastern. And it is of still more weight if agreed to by the Eastern.

The evidence and criticisms of *non*-Roman Catholic writers will be preferred before that of writers of the Roman obedience.

On these materials I shall rely to make clear the justice or injustice of the common view, that the Eastern Churches knew of no primacy or privilege in Rome other than one of secular origin.

These are the documents and authorities from which I shall obtain the evidence on which to decide whether the common assertion, that the Easterns have never recognised a "papacy," be true or not.

. . . . .

My object, then, is to show from prime sources—from *Eastern* Councils and from *Eastern* Fathers—what the relations of the *Eastern* Churches with Rome really were, before Photius and his schism.

Now, this will often necessitate lengthy quotations. But, in my opinion, it is best to let an author speak for himself, and thus to show as well as possible what the meaning of the writer quoted is.[2] It will also counter any suspicion there may be of any garbling or manipulating of the evidence—that a wrong interpretation is put upon the essential parts—that unfair construction is built upon words taken from their context. For the same reasons I shall utilise my own translations of Greek Fathers. When I do not, I shall generally quote from the easily accessible and easily verifiable renderings of translators.

[2] cf. the wise remarks in the Preface to Darwell Stone, vol. i, *A History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*, London 1909.

who are not members of the Roman Church, e.g. the Oxford *Library of the Fathers*, *The Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, etc., after comparing the passages with the original.

. . . . .

In these nine centuries which we shall have under review there are several Eastern Churches, all united in one Faith and intercourse, yet, it is true, with a certain independence of rite and ceremony, and, to some degree, of organisation.[3] Within the Roman empire we shall find evolved four patriarchates: Alexandria (Egypt), Antioch (Syria, Cilicia, and Mesopotamia), Jerusalem (Palestine) and Constantinople (Thrace and Asia Minor), while outside the empire we shall see the National Churches of Persia, Armenia and Ethiopia.

To-day, when the "Eastern Church" is spoken of, the average man apparently thinks of the Church of Constantinople. But this Church, with no lack of justice or charity, may be fairly described as the upstart of them all. For, though destined by various causes to take the supreme position among all the Churches other than that of Rome, the Church of Constantinople, as such, did not exist until three centuries after Christ. It became the leading Eastern Church. And because it became the leading Eastern Church our chief consideration will necessarily have to be of it.

[3] See below, pp. 368 and 369.

CHAPTER II

THE PRIMACY IN THE FIRST THREE CENTURIES

ALL will be agreed that in the latter half at least of the centuries covered by our investigation, the Roman Church made great and unequivocal claims. Not only did her bishop proclaim himself the chief bishop of Christendom, on the ground that Peter had first held his see—and Peter was the chief of the apostles; not only did he consider himself the chief of the patriarchs; but he claimed to have, as successor of S. Peter, by divine right, jurisdiction over the whole Church. That he made those claims is undisputed. Did the Easterns acknowledge them? The answer to that question is the object of this book.

. . . . .

Leo the Great is generally looked upon as the full-grown assertor, if not, indeed, the inventor, of Roman claims, though for myself I find those claims asserted just as clearly and unequivocally by Celestine twenty years before him. And there are Protestant historians who see those claims made and prerogatives asserted still further back.

The Regius Professor Dr. Charles Bigg wrote,[1] "Every abuse of the mediæval and even of the later Roman Church, *Papal Infallibility*, the Immaculate Conception, not to speak of a host of others, can be not unreasonably defended from the usage of the sixth, the fifth, the fourth and even of the *third* century. This may seem a strong assertion, but in spite of the great authority of Jewel, it can be maintained. Church history is a stream of development, and it is not possible to draw a line across it at any point and say that what comes before that line is sound and what comes after it is corrupt."

It is plain therefore from these words, of one who had little sympathy with "Roman claims," that those claims are not novel. The "third century" is an early date to find those claims made. I believe that the evidence of the second and the

[1] *The Times* of March 2, 1905.

first centuries, such as it is, will be found identical in character —Rome will be seen claiming authority and expecting or demanding obedience—and for the same reasons: that her bishop is the successor of S. Peter, the chief of the apostles, the leader appointed by Christ.

Shall we find the Eastern Churches in those earlier centuries acknowledging those claims? Shall we find them acting on them? In other words, will the relations of the Eastern Churches with Rome be what they are because of the acknowledgment of those claims? To investigate and answer these questions from the evidence of the first three centuries is our more immediate task.

Documents of the first century are certainly not plentiful.

We start with the consideration of the New Testament considered simply as history; and the Roman Church relies on the New Testament to justify her claims.[2]

There are *non*-Roman Catholic scholars of the first rank, claiming to use the New Testament merely as a historical record, and to approach the books with an unprejudiced and unbiassed mind, who see in these writings an outstanding position assigned to the Apostle Peter. To them the figure of the apostolic company which emerges most conspicuously and uniquely is the figure of Simon Bar-Jona.

Bishop Gore, on the other hand, at this late day still makes the assertion: "If you read the New Testament as a whole, you see that the idea of any official authority being given to Peter over and above what was given to all the apostles has no support at all."[3] But even von Harnack sees more in the New Testament than this. "Protestant exegetes," he writes, "are inclined to underestimate the position of Peter among the apostles and in the primitive community. As early as the time of Jesus he stood at the head as spokesman and primus, and as the Messianic line of thought does not admit of a primus among the Twelve, Peter's pre-eminence must be based on his personal qualities and on their recognition by Jesus." One might judge, with Mgr. Batiffol,[4] that Harnack could have used a stronger

[2] cf. The Council of Milevis: "The authority of Your Holiness, derived as it is from the authority of Holy Scripture."

[3] *Lecture II. Catholicism and Roman Catholicism*, and see his *Roman Catholic Claims*.

[4] See Batiffol in *Blackfriars*, June 1923, Art., "Anglo-Catholics and Roman Catholics," which is a translation of Art. I in *Catholicisme et Papauté* (pp. 27–28). cf. *Catholicism and Papacy*, the Authorised English Translation (pp. 31–2). And cf. Prof. C. H. Turner in *Theology*, 1926, Art., "S. Peter in the New Testament": "In the circles from which the matter peculiar to the First Gospel was drawn the prerogative position of S. Peter

term than " recognition." However, he goes on to say: " The fact that Peter was the first to behold the Risen One safeguarded and strengthened this position, which was threatened, it may be, by that of James, but as regards the Gentile Christians remained unchanged. . . . In the Palestinian circle, in which the Gospel of Matthew originates, it was reported that Jesus had expressly declared His intention of founding His Church on Peter ; in the ' Johannine ' circle it was reported that the Risen One had entrusted him with the leadership of His flock . . . those who circulated these reports were thinking of a formal primacy in the cure of souls."

It may be that one's mind is unconsciously influenced in a direction adverse to this by the amount of space devoted in the New Testament to the Epistles of S. Paul. But it might be shown that these writings attest the same.[5] However, the conclusion that Harnack comes to is this : " If the Pauline Epistles and other sources know nothing of such a *seelsorge-primat* they do not value the less highly Peter's prestige and activity."[6] But S. Paul himself is a witness to a divinely-given primacy. At least, that is the striking conclusion arrived at by an English theologian of the first rank.

" It is clear then, I think," Professor C. H. Turner has lately written, " that the evidence of S. Paul is entirely in accord with the evidence of the Gospels as to the prerogative position assigned to S. Peter in relation to the rest of the Apostles." (*Theology*, 1926, p. 194.)

The same support is indirectly given by other writers of the critical and rationalistic school, e.g. Loisy, Holtzmann, Guinebert and others. Their arguments against the genuineness of the *locus classicus* Matt. xvi, 18 : " Thou art Peter," etc., may seem very weak and unconvincing and based on prejudice and *a priori* considerations, yet even so, they unintentionally tell

was amply recognised. But there remains, of course, still to consider the most startling testimony of all (Matthew xvi, 17–19). . . . And I Myself say to thee that thou art Rock, and on this Rock I will build my Church, and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it. . . . No words could well be more startling than these. In the Palestinian surroundings, where the First Gospel was put into shape, no sort of doubt can have existed as to the unique position conferred by Christ on His chief apostle ; and if for Palestinian we substitute ' Syrian ' or 'Antiochene,' we must ascribe the belief to Gentile as well as to Jewish Christians. Even if the belief were not based on fact, it was quite definitely held within the first fifty years of the life of the Christian society " (p. 70).

[5] cf. also Duchesne, *The Churches Separated*, p. 81, also Roiron, *Recherches de Science Religieuse* (1913), pp. 489–531, " S. Paul a Witness to the Primacy of Peter."

[6] *Entstehung und Entwickelung der Kirchenverfassung* (1910), p. 6. cf. C. Weizsäcker, *Das apostolische Zeitalter* (1920), pp. 465–7.

in the direction of " Petrine " and " Roman " assertions and claims. Loisy, e.g., would not admit that the words were ever spoken by Christ, yet, according to him, they are the interpretation of the sentiments of the Christians of the first century. So, even on such a hypothesis, they remain an eloquent and arresting testimony of the belief of primitive Christendom. But it is M. Loisy who, referring to the Protestant exegesis of this Petrine passage (Matt. xvi), writes thus: ". . . . *Si l'on veut en faire le sens historique de l'Evangile, ce ne sont plus que des distinctions subtiles et qui font violence au texte. Les paroles de Jésus visent le rôle de Pierre dans la fondation de l'Eglise, et l'on peut même dire qu'elles le supposent; elles ne sont pas conditionnelles, comme la suite le montre; bien que la foi en soit le point de départ, elles se rapportent moins à l'ordre de la foi qu'à l'ordre de l'activité apostolique et du gouvernement ecclésiastique; elles concernent donc le rôle personnel de Simon-Pierre non la seule vérité qui a été proclamée par lui. Sans doute le fondement divin et invisible de l'Eglise est Jésus lui-même; mais l'Eglise n'a pas existé tant que Jésus a été sur la terre, et quand il a eu quitté ce monde, c'est Pierre qui a été le fondement visible de l'Eglise naissante, le principal témoin de la résurrection, l'agent principal de l'Evangile du Christ, le chef principal des groupes chrétiens qui ont formé les premières Eglises, et puis l'Eglise. Sans doute aussi les autres apôtres et tous les fidèles sont des pierres de l'édifice sacré, mais la pierre fondamentale, sur laquelle est assise la maison de Dieu, est celle que le Sauveur a établie, Simon-Pierre.*"[7]

When M. Loisy deals with the charge to S. Peter recorded in John xxi he says: " *L'apôtre est chargé de la direction du troupeau chrétien à la place de Jésus. . . . En faisant de Simon son vicaire Jésus ne réhabilite pas seulement le renégat, il confirme dans sa primauté le prince des apôtres. Peut-être faudrait-il dire qu'il l'en investit. . . . Tant pour le contenu que pour la forme, et pour l'emploi caractéristique du nom de Simon, ce passage est parallèle au 'Tu es Pierre' de Matthieu et au 'Confirme tes frères' de Luc. Ce sont trois échos de la même tradition, également fidèles quant à leur substance, mais qui peuvent être plus ou moins dépendants l'un de l'autre quant à leur origine. . . . Il est très probable qu'un terme différent a été choisi pour la troisième réponse, de façon à constituer une gradation: agneaux, petites brebis, brebis ou moutons en général. Ces termes ne sont pas allégoriques de façon à représenter trois catégories de membres dans la société chrétienne; pris à part ou collectivement, ils*

[7] *Les Evangiles Synoptiques*, ii, p. 8. See also pp. 9–13.

désignent l'ensemble du troupeau chrétien ; mais la variété des termes sert à montrer qu'il n'y a pas d'exception, et que tous les fidèles du Christ, quelle que soit leur place dans la communauté, sont confiés à la sollicitude de Simon-Pierre."[8]

To return more immediately to the significance of Matt. xvi, 18, " *Si le texte est authentique,*" says M. Guinebert, " *aucun doute n'est permis . . . . il faut reconnaître que Jésus a au moins prévu la constitution de l'Eglise au sens catholique du terme, puisqu'il lui donne un chef.*" But he goes on to say : " *Malheureusement l'authenticité du passage est bien difficile à défendre.*"[9] As to this, it is interesting to note that the genuineness of the text has recently been ably defended by the Anglican critic and scholar, the Bishop of Gloucester (A. C. Headlam), who, in his *Jesus Christ in History and Faith* (pp. 221–222), thus writes :

" If you will go into all the different expressions used in the famous passage addressed to S. Peter : *'The gates of hell'; 'binding and loosing'*—the very phrase *'Simon Bar-Jonah'*—they are all Jewish Aramaic expressions, clearly belonging to a period before any Greek influence had come in.

" *And the promise to Peter, which makes him what he is, described early in the New Testament as 'the first,' harmonises exactly with the actual facts. Peter was the leader of the apostles in our Lord's lifetime, and was the leader of the primitive Christian community. Is it not natural that he should owe his position to the appointment of his Master ?* Because this passage has had read into it things which are not contained in it, and has been used to support a form of Christian teaching which many of us do not believe, there is no reason why we should suggest that it is not genuine."

However, this text, though it is the chief " Petrine " text, is far from being the only one.

If we turn now to Bishop Lightfoot's dissertation on " S. Peter in Rome,"[10] in which he deals with the apostle's primacy in the New Testament—his one concern and object, he says, is to get at historical truth : " The subject which I purpose discussing . . . is essentially mixed up with controversy, but I hope to treat it as little controversially as possible. . . . I shall pursue it, as far as possible, as a historical study." And this

[8] *Le Quatrième Evangile*, pp. 939–42.

[9] *Hist. Anc. du Chr.*, p. 226 *seq.* cf. also " Der Quellort der Kirchenidee," by F. Kattenbusch (1921), pp. 167–168, in the *Festgabe*, dedicated to Harnack, in which he treats of Peter's unique position among the apostles.

[10] *S. Clement of Rome*, ii.

is the conclusion he comes to : " Even a cursory glance at the history of the apostles, so far as it appears in the Gospel records, reveals a certain primacy of S. Peter among the twelve. He holds the first place in all the lists ; he has a precedence of responsibility and of temptation ; he sets the example of moral courage and of moral lapse. Above all, he receives special pastoral charges."[11]

Once more : it is a Russian Orthodox, Vladimir Soloviev, who, in his very remarkable book, *La Russie et l'Eglise Universelle*—a book which ought, if only for its brilliant philosophical Introduction, to be more widely known in English countries than it is—emphasises the same facts. He says that he writes as a member of the true and venerable Eastern Orthodox or Græco-Russian Church, and he remarks : " *En considérant que, parmi les disciples immédiats de Jésus, aucun n'a autant de droits à une place marquée que S. Jean l'apôtre bien-aimé, j'ai compté combien de fois les Evangiles et les Actes font mention de Jean et combien de fois de Pierre. Il se trouve que le rapport est de* 1 *à* 4 *à peu près. Saint Pierre est nommé* 171 *fois* (114 *dans les Evangiles et* 57 *dans les Actes*) *et saint Jean*—46 *fois seulement* (38 *fois dans les Evangiles—y compris les cas où il parle de lui-même d'une manière indirecte—et* 8 *fois dans les Actes*)."[12]

The same scriptural evidence has been set forth and emphasised by Spencer Jones in his *England and the Holy See*[13] (1902), pp. 101–2.

It would be impossible and absurd to urge that it was any prejudice in favour of any "Roman Claims" that induced a critic so impartial, calm and scrupulous as Bishop Lightfoot to interpret the "rock" in Matt. xvi, 18, as meaning Peter. However one may explain the sense in which Peter is the rock, he dismisses as invalid the arguments advanced from etymology and from imagery that Christ is the rock. " Our only guide," he writes, " is from the logical connection of the passages. But here there can be little doubt that the sense points not to Christ the speaker, but to Peter the person addressed as the rock."[14]

[11] *S. Clement of Rome*, ii, p. 481.

[12] *La Russie et l'Eglise Universelle* (Paris 1922), p. 66. Intro. *ibid.*, p. 154.

[13] Fr. Carson writes in *Some Prerogatives of Peter*, note p. 3 : " The Scriptural argument for the papacy has been seldom better set forth than in this work by a beneficed Anglican priest."

[14] *S. Clement of Rome*, ii, 485–486 ; cf. *ibid, ii*, 489–490 : " Peter asserts his primacy in the foundation of the Christian Church . . . . he takes the initiative at all the great crises of its development. . . . The great conquest of all still awaited him. The Church must become a world-wide Church. . . By virtue of his primacy Peter is chosen as the recipient of this revelation of revelations. . . . Cornelius the heathen is baptised ;

Once again, Soloviev, the Orthodox, writes: " " *L'Ecriture sainte nous parle de la primauté de Pierre ; son droit au pouvoir souverain ecclésiastique et absolu dans l'Eglise est attesté par la tradition orthodoxe. . . . Le germe réel et vivant du souverain pouvoir ecclésiastique que nous reconnaissons dans le prince des apôtres ne pouvait se manifester dans l'église primitive que par l'initiative pratique que Pierre prenait dans toute affaire intéressant l'Eglise Universelle comme on le voit en effet dans les Evangiles et les Actes des Apôtres.*"[15]

And to this body of evidence may now be added, what had not made their appearance when first I wrote, two weighty articles under the title of " S. Peter in the New Testament," from the pen of C. H. Turner, Ireland Professor of Exegesis at Oxford (see *Theology*, August and October, 1926). This study, from which I can now give only two or three extracts, should be read in its entirety, as constituting in many respects a significant return to the " Catholic " exegesis of the Petrine passages in the New Testament. Dealing with the Four Gospels, he writes: " What impresses me more than anything else is the convergence of the testimony of these four documents in the prerogative position allotted to S. Peter. The writers are not simply repeating one another (p. 66) ; the more important sayings are different, the indications to all appearance independent ; but they cohere to a remarkable degree, and they must, I think, be taken to represent the common attitude of all parts and sections of the Christian society in its earliest stages " (p. 67).

Of the Gospel of S. Mark he says: " Like the others, it marks out Peter as the leader and spokesman of the disciples " ; and later observes: " None of the other Gospels adds anything to our knowledge of S. Peter, save in the direction of further confirmation of his pre-eminence as leader among the disciples of Christ " (p. 68).

" S. Luke's Gospel," remarks Professor Turner further on, " comes into line with S. Matthew and S. John in thus assigning to our Lord a solemn commission of leadership—we might almost say of authority—to His chief apostle " (p. 74). He corrects even the Revised Version, faithfully rendering the Greek Βόσκε τὰ ἀρνία μου. Ποίμαινε τὰ πρόβατά μου. Βόσκε τὰ προβάτιά μου (John xxi), Feed my lambs. *Rule* my sheep. Feed my little sheep. And he comments, " He . . . . charges the

and at one stroke all the privileges of the Church are laid before the whole Christian world."

[15] *La Russie et l'Eglise Universelle*, p. 154. cf. Appendix I.

apostle solemnly to feed His lambs and to *rule* and feed His little sheep. Thus Matthew, Luke and John are at one in recording some definite saying of our Lord which raises S. Peter to a unique position above the other apostles. . . . The constant tradition of the primitive Church, so far as we have it positively expressed, asserted the unique prerogative of S. Peter " (p. 75).

These independent authorities will suffice.

Now, I myself am not required, at any rate at this stage, to discuss in what sense S. Peter was held to be the rock.[16] I simply have to point out that unprejudiced philosophers like Soloviev, and independent critics of whom Lightfoot is an example, come to the conclusion that whatever S. Peter's position be, " still it is a primacy—a pre-eminence."

I am not concerned personally to prove the primacy of Peter from the New Testament. I simply take as a starting-point the fact that *non-Roman Catholic* writers see in the records a primacy of Peter. It is true that Harnack maintains that there is a " ditch " between Christ and the apostles—they have misunderstood and misinterpreted their Master. He will indeed later maintain that there is another ditch between the teaching of Clement and the teaching of Cyprian, though he will argue that after the ditch " Catholic " and " Roman " become in some sense synonymous.[17] His value, indeed, as a witness to a primacy is the rather increased by his peculiar position.

But what I am at pains at this point to find out is this: whether *Easterns* of sub-apostolic times recognised any personal privilege in S. Peter; whether *they* saw in the *Gospel records* " a primacy, a pre-eminence "; whether they saw any connection between S. Peter and Rome and the Bishop of Rome; whether any support can be had from the remains of that early time that Easterns acknowledged that " Catholic " and " Roman " were in any way synonymous; whether they held that communion in faith with " Rome " meant the guarantee of their own belief and practice.

Thus far the historical books we have had in view are the books of the New Testament—and these are " Eastern " books. The liturgical offices which the Eastern Churches to-day use are surely valid evidence of what the Easterns then believed the " Petrine " passages in the Gospels and Acts to mean. For

[16] Even Bishop Gore writes of Matt. xvi. 18, that S. Peter is the Rock. See *R. C. Claims*, p. 76: " It is difficult, I think, to feel any doubt that Our Lord is here pronouncing the person of Peter to be the Rock."

[17] See his well-known excursus, " Catholic and Roman," in his *History of Dogma*.

these Churches always boast their conservatism and unchangeableness. How is the remarkable language of these offices to be explained—fuller and more explicit even than in the corresponding offices of their Western brethren—if what they sing now they did not believe then ?

There is here, in these liturgical offices and hymns, no room, no opportunity for bringing the would-be explanation of " compliment " or " adulation," or worse, which we shall remark later, as again and again urged by those who wish to water down or explain away the startling language of Greek Councils and Greek Fathers to and of the Bishops of Rome.

These liturgical offices show that the answer to the first question we have posed—" Was Peter the chief of the apostles ? "—was, as Easterns interpreted the New Testament, unequivocally " Yes " ; for in these hymns and formularies we find constantly such titles and eulogies bestowed on Peter as the following, which the Church of Constantinople sings to-day :

" The Foundation of the Church and the Rock of the Faith."

ἡ κρηπὶς τῆς ἐκκλησίας καὶ ἡ πέτρα τῆς πίστεως

" The Immovable Basis of Dogmas."

δογμάτων βάσις ἄσειστος.

" The Throne of the Faith."

ἕδρα τῆς πίστεως

" Sitting on the First Throne of the Apostles."

τῶν ἀποστόλων πρωτόθρονος[18]

Cardinal Pitra, in his *Hymnographie,* gives many very striking passages from the Greek offices relative to S. Peter, which not only show the belief in the primacy of Peter among the apostles as being the Easterns' interpretation of the Scriptural passages, but *also manifest the fact that Easterns believed that Peter was the first Bishop of Rome.* These few examples can be taken as typical of many :

A. ἡ κορυφαία κρηπὶς τῶν ἀποστόλων . . . . καὶ γέγονας Ῥώμης τε πρῶτος ἐπίσκοπος (Office of Feast of S. Peter's Chain).[19]

Supreme foundation of the apostles . . . thou didst also become first Bishop of Rome.

B. Ῥώμης ὁ πολιοῦχος, καὶ τῆς βασιλείας
ὁ ταμιοῦχος, ἡ πέτρα τῆς πίστεως,

[18] Nilles, *Kalendarium,* i, pp. 72, 121, 138, 323. See also *Echos d'Orient,* i, 307-309, "Les titres glorieux de l'Apôtre saint Pierre dans l'hymnographie grecque." cf. Tondini, *La primauté de saint Pierre prouvée par les titres que lui donne l'église russe dans sa liturgie* (Paris, 1867).

[19] *Pitra,* p. 57.

ὁ στρεῤῥός θεμέλιος τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας
ἱεροῖς ὑμνείσθω ἐν ἄσμασιν.[20]
(Office of the protocoryphaei apostles, Peter and Paul.)

C. τῆς Ῥώμης δὲ γέγονας
σὺ πρωτεπίσκοπος
τὴς παμμεγίστου τῶν πόλεων
δόξα καὶ κλέος
καὶ ἐκκλησίας, Πέτρε, ἑδραίωμα.
καὶ πύλαι ᾅδου
οὐ κατισχύσουσιν ὄντως τάυτης
Χριστὸς ὡς προέφησεν.[21]
(Office for All Apostles. June 30.)

. . . . .

It seems strange that both Lightfoot and Harnack, although maintaining the primacy of Peter in the scriptural records, yet both deny his Roman episcopate.[22] Lightfoot is quite convinced that S. Peter visited Rome and suffered martyrdom there.[23] But he maintains that S. Peter's primacy was temporary, and ended when the Gentiles were admitted into the Church; that though Peter was in Rome, he was not Bishop of Rome. Now, here it is very important to remember that in Dr. Lightfoot's view "apostles were not bishops," and that the office of bishops was "not a continuation of the apostolate." He develops this in a marginal note in his "Dissertations."[24] "The episcopate," he lays down, "was formed not out of the apostolic order by localisation, but out of the presbyteral by elevation. . . . The functions of the apostle and the bishop differed widely. The apostle . . . . held no local office. He was essentially, as his name denotes, a missionary, moving

[20] *ibid.*, p. 120.
(B) Of Rome the president and of the kingdom
The treasurer, the Rock of the Faith,
The firm Foundation of the Catholic Church,
Let him be hymned in sacred praises.

[21] *ibid.*, p. 137.
(C) Of Rome made first Bishop
Thou wert the praise and glory of the greatest of all cities,
And of the Church, O Peter, the foundation,
And the gates of Hell
Shall never prevail against it,
As Christ foretold.

[22] Dr. Kidd writes: "No other Church in East or West has ever claimed that S. Peter died there, or that it possessed his tomb. Churches that never have owned the Roman supremacy accept the tradition that Rome is the See of Peter." *Ch. Hist.* p. 52. cf. Döllinger, *First Age of the Church*, ii, pp. 164-6.

[23] *ibid.*, ii, p. 491.

[24] pp. 154–155.

from place to place, founding and confirming the brotherhoods. . . . .It is not therefore to the apostle that we must look for the prototype of the bishop. How far indeed and in what sense the bishop may be called the successor of the apostles will be a proper subject for consideration, but the succession at least does not consist in an identity of office."

Harnack, on the other hand, holds quite unreasonably that until nearly the middle of the second century the Roman Church had a presbyterian form of government, without any monarchical bishops. This, however, is contradicted by Lightfoot, who, speaking of the time when S. Ignatius' epistles were written, says: "It would be an excess of scepticism, with the evidence before us, to question the existence of the episcopate as a distinct office from the presbyterate in the Roman Church."[25] Yet, if either of these contentions is granted, the difficulty is increased of accounting for the prominence and pre-eminence that they both acknowledge the Roman Church to have had in the last decade of the first century. For Lightfoot maintains that in A.D. 95 the Roman Church is seen as "the most prominent Church in Christendom," and he finds evidence of "a pre-eminence of rank" and of "a primacy in the Roman Church," and "a certain precedence of the Roman Church over the other Churches of Christendom."[26]

He professes to find the fact that the Roman Church was situated in the imperial city, and its moral earnestness and practical charity sufficient to account for all this. He maintains that the primacy of the Roman Church was not due to the primacy of her bishop. On the contrary, the primacy of the bishop was, he asserts, due to the primacy of the Roman Church —and this was chiefly because it was in Rome. Parenthetically there seems considerable point in the recent remark of Mgr. Batiffol: "*Tout au plus pourrait-on lui reprocher d'en avoir négligé les antécédents et d'avoir trop vite présupposé que la primauté de l'Eglise romaine était inévitable dès là que l'Eglise romaine était l'église de la métropole du monde. Nous ne voyons pas, en effet, que pareille primauté se soit établie dans le judaïsme de la* diaspora, *ou dans le marcionisme, ou dans le mithraïsme.*"[27]

. . . . .

In the year 96 it is a fact that the Roman Church claims to be, and is recognised to be, the representative of doctrinal unity; and claims to have, and is acknowledged to have, a responsi-

[25] *Ignatius and Polycarp*, i, 395.
[26] *ibid.*, i, 58, 61.
[27] Batiffol's "Rejoinder," *The Christian East*, Dec. 1924.

bility towards other Churches. This is obvious from a perusal of the lengthy letter of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians.[28] This epistle, the first of the non-inspired Christian writings, is important in any case; but it is specially important for our purpose, in that it is written to a Greek Church, and this "Eastern" Church (as we may term it) accepts it, reveres it, and treasures it.

There is practical unanimity among the critics that it was written *c.* 96. It is plain from Chapter I that it was written at a time of persecution, and this perhaps accounts for the absence of the name of the writer, of which an amount of controversial capital has been essayed to be made, although it was the custom of the times for such a letter to be written in the name of the Church in the same way as this is addressed to a Church—to the Church of Corinth.[29]

The best critics, following the ancient authorities, are unanimous that it is the work of Clement, and breathes his own spirit. "Under this Clement," writes the Greek bishop, Irenæus, "a no slight discussion having arisen among the brethren at Corinth, the Church of Rome sent a most powerful epistle to the Corinthians, confirming them together unto peace, and setting aright their faith."[30] Clement of Alexandria *c.* 200 frequently quotes the epistle as Clement's, as also do Origen and Eusebius and Dionysius of Corinth.

"*L'épître de saint Clément aux Corinthiens*," says M. Loisy, "*est écrite au nom de l'église romaine, et la personnalité du rédacteur ne se montre pas; néanmoins la lettre a été reçue et gardée comme épître de Clément, qui en était l'auteur responsable et l'organe officiel de la communauté. Cette même épître fait voir que l'église romaine s'intéressait à la vie intérieure des chrétientés*

[28] See Art., "Clément Ier," in *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*, by P. Godet, *t.* iii, col. 48, *seq.*

[29] cf. e.g. S. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians, written collectively yet addressing someone personally without naming him (*c.* iv, 3), and Revelation, addressed by S. John to the Seven Churches. Though, indeed, in the letter of S. Clement there is no mention of an individual, Coustant says: "Clement preferred, however, to write it in the name of his Church, rather than in his own name; either because at that time bishops were not wont to act without taking counsel of their Church, as Cyprian recorded of himself in his Epistle V to his clergy in the words: 'Of myself alone I could not answer; for from the beginning of my episcopate I determined to take no step of my own private judgment, without your consent and the consent of the people': or, again, lest he might seem to be partial and one-sided if, in his endeavour to restore due honour and respect for their priests among the Corinthians, either himself alone or together with the clergy but without the people, he should address the Church at Corinth."—*Epistolæ RR. Pontificum*, Epist. I, Clementis, n.1, nota. a.

[30] *Adv. Haer.* III, iii, 3. *P.G.* vii, 850.

éloignées et se croyait le droit d'y intervenir avec autorité. Paul n'aurait pas parlé aux Corinthiens divisés avec plus de force que Clément, bien que ce soit encore la communauté héritière de la tradition apostolique, non le successeur personnel de Pierre, qui semble avoir la parole. Cette distinction est accessoire, car le sentiment de l'autorité reste identique chez Clément qui parle au nom de l'église dont il est mandataire autant que le président, et chez Victor, chez Callixte, chez Etienne, qui parlent (plus tard) en leur nom propre et comme tenant la place de l'apôtre Pierre." [31]

The writing of this letter shows the outstanding position of the Roman Church at such an early date—sixty years after the foundation of the Christian society.

It is so extraordinarily significant, in that at that very time S. John was still alive at Ephesus, and many of the disciples of apostles must have still been living at Corinth. And yet it is the Bishop of Rome who writes in the name of his Church to reprove the Church at Corinth, founded by an apostle, and to set matters right.

If Clement was requested by the Corinthians to intervene, it is remarkable. Why did they not rather appeal to S. John, an apostle, who was certainly nearer ?

If Clement of his own initiative intervened, it is equally arresting ; for it shows what " right " he considered he had, and it is evident that his interference was not resented, nor that " right " contested, for the letter was preserved by the Corinthians and publicly read as one of their most treasured possessions. [32]

The existence of this letter proves that the Roman Church claimed a right of supervision and exercised a quite unique authority ; and the other church, though founded by an apostle and not founded from Rome, yet recognised the right of Rome's supervision, and by its action the duty of subordination. [33]

[31] *L'Evangile et l'Eglise,"* p. 143.

[32] See " Letter of Pope Soter," Eusebius, *H.E.*, iv, 23.

[33] That the references to the special powers of Rome and its bishop in these early writings are so few is not nearly so amazing as that the references, being so few, the right of the Roman leadership should be so fully developed and accepted. It is, however, a Roman Catholic scholar who says : " The most eminent Protestant scholars in Germany take a view of the development of the Roman Church which in some cases, I think, exaggerates its rapidity and its import." This learned writer goes on to make a very acute and weighty observation and comparison, to which I entirely subscribe. " But when all allowances are made, the facts, few as they are, present us with a surprising development in an age when the relation of the Son of God to the Father, and the divinity of the Holy Ghost (to take instances from cardinal doctrines) were ill understood or misunderstood, or incorrectly stated by Catholic writers " (J. Chapman, *Bishop Gore and the Catholic Claims*, p. 62). And see the same writer's

What exactly had happened at Corinth is uncertain, but it is evident that there had been a revolt and that some members of the presbyteral college had been deposed.

It is not altogether fanciful to see in the bearers of this letter, Claudius Ephebus and Valerius Bito and Fortunatus (this last perhaps a Corinthian) the prototypes of what we know later as " papal legates."

No one reading this letter through can fail to be struck by its sense of self-consciousness and its extraordinary self-assertion and sense of authority. It is couched in no weak and halting terms. " It is strenuous, even peremptory," says Dr. Lightfoot, " in the authoritative tone it assumes " ; and he even goes so far as to describe the letter as " the first step toward Papal domination," while he bids us observe " the urgent and almost imperious tones which the Romans adopt in addressing their Corinthian brethren during the closing years of the first century."[34]

Dr. Lightfoot frankly and with candour states the facts as he sees them, but sometimes draws from them conclusions the very reverse of what one would expect. It is difficult to reconcile his description of the Epistle as the " first step towards papal domination " with his reading of the motive prompting it, " strong only in the righteousness of their cause, and feeling

remarks in *Downside Review* (May 1925), pp. 89–90, Art., "Monseigneur Batiffol and the Apostolic See."

[34] *Ignatius and Polycarp*, i, 398. *S. Clement of Rome*, i, 70, 69, 250. The whole passage from Lightfoot is useful to have at hand at this point of the discussion : " The language of this letter, though itself inconsistent with the possession of papal authority in the person of the writer, enables us to understand the secret of the growth of papal domination. It does not proceed from the Bishop of Rome, but from the Church of Rome. . . . The name and personality of Clement are absorbed in the Church of which he is the spokesman. This being so, it is the more instructive to observe the urgent and almost imperious tone which the Romans adopt in addressing their Corinthian brethren during the closing years of the first century. . . . It may perhaps seem strange to describe this noble remonstrance as the first step towards papal domination. And yet undoubtedly this is the case. There is all the difference in the world between the attitude of Rome towards other Churches at the close of the first century, when Romans as a community remonstrate on terms of equality with the Corinthians on their irregularities, strong only in the righteousness of their cause, and feeling, as they had a right to feel, that their counsels of peace were the dictation of the Holy Spirit, and its attitude at the close of the second century, when Victor the bishop excommunicates the Church of Asia Minor for clinging to a usage in regard to the celebration of Easter which had been handed down to them from the apostles, and thus foments instead of healing dissensions. Even the second stage has carried the power of Rome only a very small step in advance towards the assumption of a Hildebrand or an Innocent or a Boniface or even a Leo : but it is nevertheless a decided step. . . . It was originally a primacy, not of the Episcopate, but of the Church."

as they had a right to feel that their counsels of peace were the dictation of the Holy Spirit." If, as Lightfoot says, the letter " did not emanate from the bishop but from the Church of Rome " ; if Clement's " existence (is) not once hinted at " ; if it be the fact that " his name and personality (are) absorbed in the Church from which it emanated," where does the " papal domination " come in ?

But in his alleged absence of legal title of any kind Lightfoot is supported by Harnack, who urges that having laid down fixed rules for her own guidance, the Roman Church was simply moved by loving, motherly care towards outlying communities, so illustrating that faith which already the Apostle Paul had commended (Rom. i, 8). " She knows the commandments and ordinances προστάγματα καὶ δικαιώματα of God, whereas the conduct of the sister Church evinces her uncertainty in the matter. She is in an orderly condition, whereas the sister community is threatened with dissolution ; she adheres to the κανὼν τῆς παραδόσεως whilst the other body stands in need of exhortation, and in these facts her claim to authority consists."

This criticism, even though adverse, is valuable as testimony of the prominence and pre-eminence of the Roman Church at such an early date. But that its claim to authority rested solely or chiefly on its moral pre-eminence is not sufficient to account for the presence of some passages in the letter itself.[35] Take the following example :

" By reason of the sudden and repeated calamities and reverses which are befalling us, brethren, we consider that we have been somewhat tardy in giving heed to the matters of dispute that have arisen among you, dearly beloved, and to the detestable and unholy sedition . . . . which a few headstrong and self-willed persons have kindled " (*c.* 1).

" Somewhat tardy " ! I should see in these words a consciousness of authority and duty owed to the Corinthian Church. Clement bids them be " obedient unto the excellent and glorious will of God." And there is more of like substance. He urges them to pray for those who have caused the disaffection, " that they *yield not unto us but unto the will of God.*"

This is significant language, at any rate if taken in connection with what follows in the letter (*c.* 59). " But if certain persons should be disobedient unto the words *spoken by Him through us* let them understand that they will entangle themselves in no

35 To say nothing of the references which will be adduced from Ignatius and others further on.

slight transgression and danger; but we shall be guiltless of this sin."

It is possible in these words to see some sort of threat, and in the sending of the "faithful and prudent men that have walked among us from youth unto old age unblamably, who shall be witnesses between you and us" (*c.* 63), ambassadors who will see that the rulings of the Roman authority are carried out. "Receive our counsel," says Clement once more, "and ye shall have no occasion of regret." And still more forcibly: "Ye shall give us great joy and gladness if ye render obedience unto *the things written by us through the Holy Spirit*" (*c.* 63). This startling claim spontaneously recalls to one's mind the Council of Jerusalem and the necessity of the acceptance of its decisions by the faithful, since "it seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us" (Acts xv, 28).

In *c.* 40, 42, 44, there are passages which bear on a point already raised—the alleged "absorption" of the bishop in the Church. In these chapters Clement speaks of and distinguishes the three orders of the ministry (though indeed he uses indifferently the *words* "bishop" and "priest") and speaks of their functions, thus anticipating in his own way the more extended exhortations of Ignatius.

Is all this reconcilable with Bishop Lightfoot's surmise (for it is really only such) that episcopacy at Rome was in a very embryonic state? How can this letter counsel submission to and harmony with the hierarchy, the divine constitution of the Church, at Corinth, if there is not the same harmony and submission at Rome? This of itself shows the pervading personality and the authorship of Clement, though of course he is eagerly and enthusiastically supported by his flock—thus giving a practical illustration of what he desires the Corinthians to be.

Once more in *c.* 5 Clement writes: "Let us set before our eyes the good apostles. There was Peter, who by reason of unrighteous jealousy endured not one nor two but many labours, and thus having borne his testimony went to his appointed place of glory. By reason of jealousy and strife Paul by his example pointed out the prize of patient endurance. After that he had been seven times in bonds, had been driven into exile, had been stoned, had preached in the East and in the West, he won the noble renown which was the reward of his faith, having taught righteousness unto the whole world and having reached the farthest bounds of the West; and when he had borne his testimony before the rulers, so he departed

from the world and went unto the holy place, having been found a notable pattern of patient endurane."

Now, Bishop Lightfoot's comment on this section is of importance here. " If the use of the word μαρτυρήσας in both cases could leave any doubt that they suffered death for the faith, the context is decisive. But why are these two Apostles, and these only mentioned? Why not James, the son of Zebedee? Why not James, the Lord's brother? Both these were martyrs. The latter was essentially 'a pillar,' and his death was even more recent. Obviously because Clement was appealing to examples which they themselves had witnessed. Paul was martyred in Rome, as is allowed on all hands. Is not the overwhelming inference that Peter suffered in this same city also? This inference is all the more certain when we find that outside this testimony of Clement tradition is constant in placing his death at Rome."[36]

An attempt has recently been made in a much-lauded but really not very important book to explain away the force of this allusion to the martyrdom of Peter and Paul in this letter of Clement. Professor E. T. Merrill of the University of Chicago in his *Essays in Early Church History* (1924) makes a novel assertion. He says that, instead of its being the work of Clement, the third bishop of Rome from S. Peter, the Epistle is the work of a forger, writing about the year 140, who has concocted it by using the letter of Polycarp, imitating its phraseology and then attributing it to a probably fabulous Clement.

Most critics, it has already been pointed out, fix the date of the epistle c. 96, and indeed Bishop Lightfoot has argued the very reverse of this new critic—that Polycarp had Clement's letter before him and utilised and imitated its phraseology, and thus the parallelisms are accounted for.[37] From a comparison of both the epistles with the phraseology of the New Testament a learned writer has recently proved conclusively that the epistle of Clement must be placed mid-way between the New Testament and Polycarp's epistle.[38]

If one is struck by the fact that Clement says more to the Corinthians about S. Paul than about S. Peter, the reason is not far to seek.

[36] *S. Clement of Rome*, ii, 493. See, too, the extract from Bishop Chase's article in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, iii, 777, given in Appendix II.

[37] And cf. Art., " Clement I " in *Cath. Encyc.* (J. Chapman): " The Epistle of Polycarp is entirely modelled on that of Clement, and borrows from it freely."

[38] See Dom. B. Capelle, *Revue Bénédictine*, April 1925, pp. 283–7: " La Prima Clementis et l'épître de Polycarpe."

S. Paul had founded their Church. The example of the apostle who had "laboured more abundantly than they all" would naturally have a special weight with the Corinthians. And although he was martyred at Rome, he was an apostle both to Rome and to Corinth. S. Paul therefore would make a peculiar appeal to their proper pride and loyalty.

This examination of the letter of Clement, who, as Irenæus says "both saw the apostles themselves and conferred with them," and who "had the preaching of the apostles still resounding in his ears and their tradition before his eyes,"[39] evidences, in my judgment, the primacy of the Roman bishop. And the way in which the letter was regarded by the recipients shows consequently that these "Easterns" of the first century acknowledged the same.

Eusebius thus refers to the epistle of Clement when recording the letters which Dionysius of Corinth wrote "to the Romans and addressed to Soter."

"In this same epistle he makes mention also of Clement's epistle to the Corinthians, showing that it had been the custom from the beginning to read it in the Church. His words are as follows: 'To-day we have passed the Lord's holy day, in which we have read your epistle. From it, whenever we read it, we shall always be able to draw advice, as also from the former epistle, which was written to us through Clement.'"[40]

. . . . .

Clement of Rome affords additional, if indirect, testimony to the special importance attached in the East to the See of Rome.

In Syria appeared *c.* 200 the romance, the "Clementines," recounting the itinerary of S. Peter to Antioch. Clement is represented as his companion, and, indeed, as the author of the book. At the end there is attached a letter of Clement to James of Jerusalem, describing Peter presenting Clement to the Christians at Rome as the future ruler of their Church when he himself is dead.[41]

Clement, again, is represented as the secretary in the so-called "Apostolic Constitutions," which give a record of supposed

[39] *Adv. Haer.*, iii, *c.* 3.

[40] Eusebius, *H.E.*, iv, 23.

[41] See Bardenhewer, *Patrology*, pp. 82–84. Chapman, *Cath. Encyc.*, suggests that they are the work of an Arian author in the East, not far from Cæsarea, before 350. The letter from Clement to James is addressed to the latter as "Bishop of bishops, who rules Jerusalem, the holy Church of the Hebrews, and the Churches everywhere."

With this cf. Maycock, *The Papacy*, p. 20.

apostolical rules of liturgy and discipline promulgated by a council of the apostles.[42]

These writings belong to the beginning of the fifth century and are probably the work of Apollinarian Syrians.

The Canons of the Apostles, with which we are concerned in the Council " in Trullo" (see p. 285), show Clement in the same way as the accredited witness of apostolic tradition, because successor of Peter in the See of Peter.[43]

The fact that the documents are more or less apocryphal does not militate against the value of their witness here. The point is that they are *Eastern* productions, and they represent Clement the head of the Roman Church as the best authority for apostolic tradition. " Thus the East voluntarily placed its rule of discipline under the patronage of the ancient Roman Church."[44]

. . . . .

" It is no part of my business," writes F. W. Puller, " to explain how the story of S. Peter's Roman episcopate was originated and spread."[45]

And I, too, would emphasise, that it is no part of *my* business to prove S. Peter's Roman episcopate. All I am concerned to do is to point out that *Easterns* held that S. Peter was Bishop of Rome (whether they were right or wrong is not now my concern). And in this dissertation on the relations of the Eastern Churches to Rome before the Schism of Photius, those relations will be manifested as coloured and influenced by and depending on the belief that Peter was first Bishop of Rome. So, when Soloviev[46] says that Peter and his successors have been recognised as supreme judge in matters of religion by Irenæus, Denys, Athanasius, Chrysostom, Cyril, Flavian, Theodoret, Maximus, Theodore of Studium and the Patriarch Ignatius, he is only stating the simple fact—a fact which can be verified by reference to the detailed examination of the writings of these fathers in later pages of this book.

I repeat, if Athanasius, Chrysostom, Cyril and the rest were all mistaken in their belief in Peter's Roman episcopate, the onus is on the objector to show that they were all mistaken; but the fact of history remains that they all actually did believe

[42] Bardenhewer, *ibid.*, p. 349 ; and *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*, Art., " Constitutions Apostoliques," by F. Nau, *t.* iii, col. 1520, *seq.*

[43] Tixeront, *Précis de Patrologie*, p. 281. Duchesne, *Churches Separated*, p. 87. *D. T. C.* Art., " Canons des Apôtres," by F. Nau, *t.* ii, col. 1605.

[44] Duchesne, *Op. cit.* p. 89. See also the exhaustive article on " The Clementines," by Dom. J. Chapman, in the *Cath. Encyc.*

[45] *The Primitive Church and the See of Rome* (1900), p. 41.

[46] *La Russie et l'Eglise Universelle*, p. 66. Introduction.

Peter to have been the first Bishop of Rome. And I think that examination of their writings will show besides that they considered that Peter had a peculiar prerogative, and that that privilege was inherited by his successors in the See of Rome.

The pursuit of our investigation will make plain that the attitude of Easterns towards the Bishop of Rome is only explicable by this belief; in other words, their own writings, their own actions will demonstrate that their relations were what they were, because they did so believe.

. . . . .

Now, although Fr. Puller says it is no part of his task to account for the origin of the story of S. Peter's Roman episcopate, yet he proceeds a little further on to say, "However, for my own part, I feel little doubt that it is to the Clementine romance we must look for the true origin of the story. This romance was a heretical production, written by some unknown author in the interests of the Ebionitish sect."[47]

Unfortunately, however, for the basing of this, the first of the Roman "claims" upon these "Clementine" fabrications, the best modern criticism postulates, as has been seen, a much later date for their production. Forgeries though they be, they have evidential value. They are, anyhow, *Eastern* productions.

They show what, at the time of their appearing was thought in the *East* of the See of Rome.[48]

. . . . .

Before leaving Clement there is another early writing which deserves passing notice—since by one or two passages it supplies support of the primacy of the See of Rome—the series of *Visions* accounted by such great names as Irenæus and Origen even as inspired, and known as "The Shepherd of Hermas."

In *Vision* II (4, 3) Hermas, the author, is represented as a contemporary of S. Clement of Rome, but whether or no he is

[47] *ibid.*, p. 41. He finds agreement on the part of Lightfoot, Bright and Salmon in his theory that the "Clementines" originated the idea of S. Peter being the first Bishop of Rome. As regards the Ebionitish suggestion, it should be observed that the author was no Ebionite, since he believes in the pre-existence of the Son, the Incarnation, and the Miraculous Birth.

[48] For an exhaustive treatment of the "Clementines" see the article "Clementines" by J. Chapman in the *Cath. Encyc.* Also Headlam in *Journal of Theological Studies*, iii, 41, and one by Chapman in iii, 436.

Puller's argument, pp. 41–49 *Op. cit.*, is derived from Tübingen sources, and, says Duchesne, "is now abandoned by all the learned in Germany and elsewhere."

For Clement's commemoration in the Eastern Church to-day, see Nilles, *Kalendarium*, i, 22, ii, 401, 464, 486, etc.

the Hermas saluted by S. Paul (Rom. xvi, 14), as the great Origen thought, he was probably of *Greek* extraction.[49]

Most critics are inclined to accept the statement of the Muratorian Canon, that Hermas was a brother of Pius I, who governed the Roman Church from the year 140 to the year 155 or thereabouts. " As to the ' Shepherd,' " says the Muratorian fragment, " it was written very recently in our times in the city of Rome—by Hermas, while his brother, Bishop Pius, sat in the chair of the Church of Rome. And therefore it also ought to be read ; but it cannot be made public in the Church to the people, nor placed among the prophets, as their number is complete, nor among the apostles to the end of time."

The work was widely read in the East, but about the fourth century it began in the West to be forgotten.[50] Hermas tells us that it was *the special privilege of the Bishop of Rome to keep up correspondence with the Churches abroad.*

In *Vision* ii, 4, this command is given to Hermas :

> " Thou shalt, therefore, write two copies of the book ; thou wilt send one to Clement and the other to Grapte. And Clement will send his to foreign countries, for permission has been granted him to do so (*Illi enim permissum est*). And Grapte will admonish the widows and orphans. Thou, on thy part, wilt read it here in the city, together with the presbyters presiding over the Church."[51]

. . . . .

The earliest decade of the second century gives us the invaluable Seven Epistles of the *martyr Bishop of Antioch, Ignatius,* who, as Eusebius relates, " was sent from Syria to Rome and became food for wild beasts on account of his testimony to Christ."[52] Though under the strictest military surveillance, he was able to preach to the various Christian communities that lay on his route and to exhort them to cleave steadfastly to the tradition of the apostles. With the same object he wrote several epistles to various Churches, among which was one to the Church of Rome—and this stands out uniquely from the rest.

Before assessing the evidence which this *Eastern* bishop may afford in his letters to the primacy of Rome and the primacy of

[49] " Le Pasteur d'Hermas," in *Mélanges de Patrologie* (1921), p. 22. See also *Précis de Patrologie* (1923), pp. 30–35, both by Tixeront.

[50] S. Jerome *Vir. Ill.* 10.

[51] See *Ante-Nicene Library,* vol. i. Grapte obviously was a deaconess whose work lay with the widows.

[52] *H.E.,* iii, 36. Felder, *Christ and the Critics,* i, p. 48, *seq.*

the Roman bishop, the first thing that strikes one in reading the epistles is the marked difference there is in the way he addresses the Roman Church compared with the terms he uses in the inscription to the other Churches. In his epistle "To the Trallians" the address runs:

> "elect and worthy of God, having peace in flesh and spirit through the passion of Jesus Christ, who is our hope through our resurrection unto Him; which Church also I salute in the Divine plenitude after the apostolic fashion, and I wish her abundant greeting."

And similarly to the Philadelphians he describes their church as that

> "which hath found mercy and is firmly established in the concord of God and rejoiceth in the passion of our Lord and in His resurrection without wavering, being fully assured in all mercy; which Church I salute in the blood of Jesus Christ, that is eternal and abiding joy."

In his letter to the Ephesians one hears again the accents of S. Paul's epistle addressed to the same community:

> "unto her which hath been blessed in greatness through the plenitude of God the Father; which hath been fore-ordained before the ages to be for ever unto abiding and unchangeable glory, united and elect in a true passion by the will of the Father and of Jesus Christ our God."

To the Magnesians the inscription is of the simplest.

To the Church of Smyrna, over which Bishop Polycarp ruled, he inscribes his letter thus:

> "Ignatius, who is also Theophorus, unto Polycarp, who is Bishop of the Church of the Smyrnaeans, or rather whose Bishop is God the Father and Jesus Christ, abundant greeting.
>
> "Welcoming thy godly mind, which is grounded as it were on an immovable rock, I give exceeding glory that it hath been vouchsafed to me to see thy blameless face, whereof I would fain have joy in God."[53]

But when he comes to write to the Roman Church the inscription of his epistle is couched in remarkable terms. The letter to the Romans is inscribed:

> "to the Church that hath found mercy .... that hath been beloved and enlightened (πεφωτισμένῃ) by the will of Him

[53] Lightfoot, *Ignatius and Polycarp*, vol. ii, sec. 1, pp. 539–570.

who willeth all things, and that are according to the love of Jesus Christ."

And it is lauded as :

ἀξιώθεος, ἀξιοπρεπής, ἀξιομακάριστος,
ἀξιέπαινος, ἀξιεπίτευκτος, ἀξίαγνος,

which Lightfoot translates thus : " worthy of God, worthy of honour, worthy of felicitation, worthy of praise, worthy of success, worthy in purity."

" The first testimony of an outsider to this community," remarks Harnack, " is afforded by Ignatius. Soften as we may all the extravagant expressions in his epistle to the Romans, it is at least clear that Ignatius conceded to them a precedence in the circle of sister Churches, and that he was well acquainted with the energy and activity displayed by them in aiding and instructing other communities." [54]

But the words which immediately precede this string of laudatory epithets, *cette magnificence verbale* as Batiffol describes it, [55] demand our attention.

ἥτις . . . . προκάθηται ἐν τόπῳ χωρίου Ῥωμαίων

There has been plenty of discussion as to what these words exactly mean. [56]

Plainly Ignatius uses the periphrasis to add grandeur and to emphasise the dignity of the community he is addressing, for his mode of address to the other churches is much simpler, e.g. " to the Church which is in Ephesus of Asia," " the Church which is in Magnesia on the Maeander," " to the holy Church which is in Tralles of Asia," " which is in Philadelphia of Asia," " which is in Smyrna of Asia."

Apart from the question as to whether the verb in this sentence is to be taken absolutely (as Roman Catholics might prefer) or simply in connection with the words that follow, the sentence is quite sufficient, in Bishop Lightfoot's judgment, to assign a primacy of rank to the Church of Rome. It may be simply translated thus :

" To the Church which presides in the place of the region of the Romans."

The next expression in the letter calling for particular notice,

54 *History of Dogma*, ii, 156. cf. d'Herbigny, *Theologica de Ecclesia*, ii, 155, *primus* (*post Paulum Rom.* i, 8) *cognoscitur testis non-Romanus de Romana Ecclesia.*

55 *L'Eglise Naissante*, p. 167.

56 See *Revue Bénédictine* (1896), vol. xiii, Art., " Saint Ignace et l'Eglise Romaine." Duchesne, *Churches Separated*, p. 85, *seq.*

and indeed bearing on this sentence, is: προκαθημένη τῆς ἀγάπης which, translated literally, is: "which presides over the love." Lightfoot understands by this that the Roman Church has the "presidence of love." She is pre-eminent in charity—conspicuous and distinguished for the abundance of her good works. But elsewhere he says the phrase "assigns to this Church a pre-eminence of rank as well as love."[57] But still more unreservedly he says of the passage that in it Ignatius "assigns a primacy to Rome."[58]

However, the parallel usage of the word ἡ ὁδός in the Acts of the Apostles, and the other passages in the writings of Ignatius where he uses ἡ ἀγάπη e.g. ἡ ἀγάπη Σμυρναίων καὶ Ἐφεσίων (Trall. xiii, 1) ἡ ἀγάπη τῶν ἀδελφῶν (Smyrn. xiii, I and Philadelph. xi, 2) and still more strikingly ἡ ἀγάπη τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν (Rom. ix, 3) seem to me decisive that by ἡ ἀγάπη he means "the Brotherhood," "the Church."

The phrase will then mean: "Presiding over the union of Christians"="*presiding over the Church.*"[59]

It is true that the Roman Church, even at the end of the first century, was specially generous, if not rich. In a letter written *c.* 170, Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth, refers to the generous alms-giving of the Roman Church as a custom inherited from their forefathers. It was so noteworthy that later on Eusebius mentions their giving assistance in unstinted measure to needy Christian communities as a custom ancient in his day.[60]

But it is impossible to think that the Roman primacy was owing chiefly to this, as Bishop Lightfoot urges. And it must be remembered that his argument is based mainly on this passage, the rendering of which is at least doubtful.[61] However, it is right to quote what he says about the letter of Ignatius:[62]

"Though Clement's letter is apparently in his mind, there is

[57] *Ignatius and Polycarp*, i, 398.

[58] *S. Clement of Rome*, i, 71.

[59] Duchesne, *Churches Separated*, p. 85, writes: "The most natural meaning of such language is that the Roman Church presides over all the Churches. As the bishop in his diocese presides over its works of charity, so does the Roman Church preside over those same works throughout Christendom." And in a footnote he quotes Harnack in support—a paper read at Berlin in 1896.

[60] Eusebius, *H. E.*, iv, 23.

[61] cf. d'Herbigny, *Theologica de Ecclesia*, ii, p. 155, note 2. "*Protestantes post Pearson . . . . Zahn et Lightfoot (vide Funk eos confutantem n.*1) *ad rationem praeeminentiae detorquebant textum, quasi dicatur 'praesidens propter caritatem.' Ille vero genitivus talem sensum respuit, absolute enim requirit designari vel regionem vel societatem cui praesideat.*"

The grammatical argument is also well dealt with by J. R. Gasquet in *Studies*, p. 269, Art., "St. Ignatius and the Roman Primacy." cf. also Funk, *Manual of Ch. Hist.*, i, 60 and Tixeront *Histoire des Dogmes*, i, 142-3.

[62] *S. Clement of Rome*, i, 69-72.

no mention of Clement or of Clement's successor throughout. Yet at the same time *he assigns a primacy to Rome.* The Church is addressed in the opening salutation as ' she who hath the presidency (προκάθηται) in the place of the region of the Romans.' But immediately afterwards the nature of this supremacy is defined.

The presidency of this Church is declared to be a presidency of love (προκαθημένη τῆς ἀγάπης). This, then, was the original primacy of Rome—a primacy not of the Bishop but of the whole Church, a primacy not of official authority, but of practical goodness, backed, however, by the prestige and advantages which were necessarily enjoyed by the Church of the metropolis. . . . And so it remains till the close of the second century. When some seventy years later than the date of our epistle a second letter is written from Rome to Corinth during the Episcopate of Soter (about A.D. 165–175), it is still written in the name of the Church, not the Bishop of Rome, and as such is acknowledged by Dionysius of Corinth. ' We have read your letter (ὑμῶν τὴν ἐπιστολήν),' he writes in reply to the Romans. At the same time he bears a noble testimony to that moral ascendancy of the early Roman Church which was the historical foundation of its primacy. ' This hath been your practice from the beginning to do good to all the brethren in various ways and to send supplies (ἐφόδια) to many Churches in divers cities, in one place recruiting the poverty of those that are in want, in another assisting brethren that are in the mines, by the supplies that ye have been in the habit of sending to them from the first, thus keeping up, as becometh Romans, a hereditary practice of Romans, which your blessed Bishop Soter hath not only maintained but also advanced '—with more to the same effect."

But even granting that the Roman Church was relatively rich *c.* A.D. 100, were her works of charity and benevolence, her gifts to poorer Churches, her assistance to brethren in the mines, her efforts of so various kinds, sufficient to make her, at that early date, everywhere the most important Church in Christendom, and to obtain for her an authority unique in doctrinal disputes ?

Was the original primacy, as he contends, simply " a primacy not of official authority but of practical goodness," and accentuated by the mere fact of its prestige of geographical and political situation ? There is, as said above, but this one sentence, and that hardly correctly translated, on which he has built his thesis.

The contentions so much in favour with Lightfoot and Harnack make it difficult to account for the " extravagance " of the language of the laudatory terms of the Roman epistle of the Bishop of Antioch.

It seems to me not unreasonable to find some explanation for Ignatius' enthusiastic language in the fact that both the " see " of the writer and the " see " of those to whom he was writing had been presided over by Peter.

And that it was the Church residing in the capital of the empire is an utterly inadequate explanation of the grandiloquent wording of the inscription and of the terms of the letter. To maintain such a proposition (so frequent in Harnack) is to forget the temporal circumstances of that Church and the unworldly outlook of the early Christians. Whatever Christians became later on, hardly yet would worldly position and pomp and power have had much, if any, weight or influence in determining in their mind the position and importance of a Church.[63]

At the time of which we are treating the Roman Church was composed *chiefly of Greeks and Orientals*, of slaves and freedmen, though there were a few members who belonged to the highest ranks. (Incidentally this latter is shown by the appeal of Ignatius to the Romans not to prevent his martyrdom, for at this time there were enough members of the Christian community at Rome in high station influential enough to have obtained his release.) It is impossible to think that the despised, insignificant, persecuted sect could have derived its prestige or authority in the eyes of other Churches simply from the fact that it happened to be situated at the centre of worldly government, still less that it should have been invested thereby with the special doctrinal authority, which both Harnack and Lightfoot own that it had even in the second century.

To return to the inscription of the epistle of Ignatius to the Romans.

There is an allusion to the purity of Roman faith (cf. Rom. i, 8) in these words :

> " Unto them that in flesh and spirit are united unto His every commandment, being filled with the grace of God without wavering (ἀδιακρίτως) and filtered clear from every foreign stain."

The Church which is marked out as προκαθημένη τῆς ἀγάπης is

[63] They were hardly, if it is allowed to put it so bluntly, " spiritual snobs." And also what becomes of the assertion so popular to-day, that they were always expecting the παρουσία ?

necessarily harmonious within itself and stable in doctrine. Ignatius therefore has no instruction or recommendation to give it. To do so, remarks Sohm, would appear to him an impertinence.

. . . . .

Οὐδεποτε ἐβασκάνατε οὐδενί· ἄλλους ἐδιδάξατε. Ἐγώ δέ θέλω ἵνα κἀκεῖνα βέβαια ᾖ, ἃ μαθητεύοντες ἐντέλλεσθε.

" Ye never grudged any one ; ye were the instructors of others. And my desire is that those lessons shall hold good which as teachers ye enjoin."[64]

The reference no doubt is to martyrdom, but the " disciples " (μαθητεύοντες) which she instructs are other Churches.

And it was indeed because of their Roman origin that the epistle of Clement and the Shepherd of Hermas were held in special honour, preserved and read as next in rank to the sacred Scriptures themselves. [To make a slight digression one may recollect that the Roman creed, according to the Protestant Kattenbusch, forms the foundation of the early Eastern creeds.][65]

So that his allusion to " instruction " here may have a wider meaning than mere example, especially if we recall the words of Dionysius of Corinth regarding Clement of Rome's letter to the Corinthians and another lately received from Rome :

" To-day we have passed the Lord's holy day, in which we have read your epistle. From it, wherever we read it, we shall be able to draw advice, as also from the former epistle which was written to us through Clement."[66]

This same is also shown by the following words of Dionysius :

" You have thus by such an admonition bound together the planting of Peter and Paul at Rome and Corinth. For both of them planted and likewise taught us in our Corinth."[67]

And this last passage seems to me particularly weighty for the very reason that the tradition that Peter worked in Corinth has little support. If this is indeed the case, the acceptance of the tradition shows a certain keenness on the part of the writer to connect his Church with the presiding and directing Church of Christendom.

. . . . .

[64] See Duchesne, *Churches Separated*, p. 86, and Tixeront, *Op. cit.* i, 142. Lightfoot, vol. ii, sec. 1, *Ignatius and Polycarp*.

[65] *Beiträge zur Geschichte des altkirchlichen Taufsymbols* (Giessen, 1892). Though Bardenhewer (Roman Catholic) is uncertain on this point. *Geschichte der Althirchlichen Litteratur* (1902) Freiburg im Breisgau.

[66] Eusebius, *H. E.*, iv, 23. [67] *Ibid.*, ii, 25.

" I do not *command* you like Peter and Paul."

οὐχ ὡς Πέτρος καὶ Παῦλος διατάσσομαι ὑμῖν.

" They were apostles ; I am a convict. They were free ; I am a slave to this very hour."

" Why should he single out Peter and Paul ? " asks Lightfoot. " He is writing from Asia Minor ; and the locality therefore would suggest John. He was a guest of a disciple of John at the time. He was sojourning in the country where John was the one prominent name."

Dr. Lightfoot answers his own question thus : " The only conceivable reason is that Peter and Paul had been in a position to give directions to the Romans, that they both alike had visited Rome and were remembered by the Roman Church."[68]

. . . . .

" Remember in your prayers the Church which is in Syria, which hath God for its shepherd in my stead. Jesus Christ alone shall be its Bishop (ἐπισκοπήσει)—He and your love."

It is possible to interpret this passage again as showing that the Syrian Church acknowledges the special leadership and superiority of the Roman Church.[69]

Doubtless it is, at first sight, remarkable that the name of the Bishop of Rome is not mentioned in the epistle of Ignatius to the Romans. Without stopping to discuss once again the alleged " merging " of the Bishop in the Church (it is, however,

[68] *S. Clement of Rome*, ii, p. 493. cf. the Protestant, Baratier, " Why does Ignatius name together Peter and Paul, unless both of them had been at Rome ? Why Peter, if he had no connection with the Romans ? For if he never went to Rome, since he did not write to the Romans, he had nought more in common with them, nor commanded them any more than James, or Jude, or John. It is evident here that Ignatius knew of S. Peter's journey to Rome." (*Disquisitio chronologica de successione antiquissima Episcoporum Romanorum*, p. 3.) cf. Funk, *Manual of Ch. Hist.*, i. p. 28. " For seeing that we have no reason to surmise that S. Peter ever wrote to the Romans these words can only mean that he had preached to them by word of mouth."

cf. Newman, *Development of Christian Doctrine* (Ed. 1900), p. 157 : " S. Ignatius of Antioch addresses the Roman Church, out of the Churches to which he writes, as ' the Church, which has in dignity the first seat of the city of the Romans,' and implies that it was too high for his directing as being the Church of SS. Peter and Paul."

[69] Renan describes Ignatius' Epistle to the Romans as " *l'un des joyaux de la littérature chrétienne primitive.*" Tixeront (*Mélanges de Patrologie*, p. 18) writes : " *Il faut remarquer que saint Ignace se trouvait, vis-à-vis des Romains, dans une situation différente de celle qu'il occupait vis-à-vis des Asiates. Ceux-ci il les connaissait : il avait traversé leurs églises ou en avait reçu des délégations. Mais il ne connaissait pas les chrétiens de Rome ; il n'avait eu aucune relation avec leur évêque ; il n'avait donc aucun conseil à leur donner. . . Mais il avait une grace à leur demander . . . qu'ils ne parvinssent à empêcher son supplice et à lui sauver la vie.*"

I believe, the last instance in which it can be alleged) it is as well to consider the purpose the writer of the epistle had in view. Primarily, it would seem, it was to urge those who could have exerted influence to prevent his execution from exercising that influence.

" It is plain," Bishop Lightfoot himself writes, " that Ignatius is apprehensive lest influence of the Roman Christians should procure a mitigation or a reversal of his sentence, so that he will be robbed of the crown of martyrdom. How was this possible ? Who were these powerful friends who might be expected to rescue him from his fall ? Twenty years earlier, or twenty years later, than the assumed date of Ignatius, it is not probable that any persons possessing sufficient influence would have been found in the Roman Church. At least we have no evidence of their existence at either date. But just at this moment Christianity occupied a position of exceptional influence at Rome. During the last years of Domitian's reign the new religion had effected a lodgment in the imperial family itself."[70]

Now, this object would not concern the bishop especially—would it not concern the laity, rather ? And there might also be motives of prudence.[71] There was no need, too, as J. H. Newman put it, for him to take the Roman bishop, " as it were, under his wing."[72] The " Bishop of Syria," as he calls himself, felt a duty to the other bishops of his region to warn, reprove and exhort them. There was no need to tell the Roman Church to be obedient to its bishop—a Church which through Clement had already exhorted an " Eastern " Church to loyal subordination to the divinely appointed hierarchy.

From this survey of the writings of Ignatius (who, according to Eusebius was,[73] if we include Peter, the third Bishop of

[70] Vol. ii, p. 185.

[71] viz. : regarding very possible persecution.

[72] See " Advertisement " to vol. i of *Essays Critical and Historical* (Ed. 1871). The comment of J. H. Newman on this absence of mention of the bishop which he made while still apparently " a member of the established Church " is worth consideration. " Ignatius writes . . . . to six Churches—five of them are Eastern. He warns each of them against heretics, and exhorts them to unity ; sometimes even he mentions by name the bishop of the Church which he is addressing, and in every case commends him to their obedience. But in the case of the sixth, the Roman Church, he does nothing of the kind. He does not say a word about heresy or schism ; he does not refer to its bishop or take him (as it were) under his wing. He hardly does more than ask the Romans for their prayers, and he entreats them not to interpose and prevent his martyrdom. Instead of exhorting them, as he does the other Churches, he says, ' I make no commands to *you* as though *I* were Peter and Paul.' " *Ibid.*, p. 253. cf. vol. ii, p. 324 (Ed. 1891).

[73] *H. E.*, ii, 22.

Antioch ; and who, if we follow the Greek Fathers Theodoret[74] and S. John Chrysostom,[75] owed his appointment and consecration to S. Peter himself) we may draw these conclusions at least : that the Roman Church had a primacy, and that that primacy was owing to its connection with S. Peter.[76]

. . . . . .

Unfortunately the Greek original of our next authority *Irenæus* is lost.

For Irenæus, though Bishop of Lyons, was a *Greek*. That fact has a tendency to sink into oblivion, and it needs to be kept well in mind.

By his Asiatic origin, by the leading position of his Church of Lyons, and by his intellectual and moral worth, the testimony of Irenæus becomes of paramount weight.

And Irenæus was a disciple of Polycarp, who, to use Irenæus' own words :

> " not only had been trained by the apostles and had conversed with many of those who had seen Christ, but also had been constituted by the apostles bishop over Asia, in the Church of Smyrna, whom we also saw in the first age of our life ; for he tarried with us long, and in extreme old age, by a glorious and distinguished martyrdom, departed this life ; having taught these things, which he learnt from the apostles, which the Church delivers, which alone are true."[77]

74 Epist. lxxxix, cxlv. *P. G.*, lxxxiii, 1284, 1384.

75 *Hom. in S. Ign.*, iv., 587. *P. G.*

76 It is of use recording here, for what it is worth, the reasoning of a Roman Catholic writer, J. R. Gasquet, *Studies*, pp. 266–7 : " St. Ignatius . . . . most urgently enforces the unity of the Church throughout the world. He bids St. Polycarp ' have a care for the unity, than which nothing is better,' and to others he says, ' All that shall repent and turn to the unity of the Church, they too shall be God's.' An earnest warning is given against schism, independently of false doctrine. ' Be not deceived, my brethren ; if any man follow one who makes a schism (σχίζοντι) he doth not inherit the Kingdom of God ; if any one walk in another doctrine he consenteth not to the Passion.' This Church is of universal extension, for ' the bishops who are at the ends of the earth are in the mind of Jesus Christ.' The Church Universal is therefore distinguished by him from each individual Church of which it is made up, and the word ' Catholic ' is first employed to designate it. Where the bishop is, there let the multitude be ; just as where Christ is, there is the Church Catholic (*Smyrn.*, viii, 2). The parallel between the particular Churches and the Church Universal—the microcosm and the macrocosm—implies a visible head of the whole as well as of each diocese, and our Saint leaves us in no doubt where that head is to be found."

77 *Irenæus*, C. Haer., iii, 3, 4. *Oxford Library of the Fathers*, p. 208. cf. Eusebius, *H. E.*, v, 20, where he preserves an extract from a letter of Irenæus to Florinus, *De Monarchia*, where he says : " These doctrines the presbyters who were before us, and who were companions of the apostles,

With such opportunities of obtaining his information, with such nearness to the apostles and converse with disciples of apostles, the evidence of Irenæus has supreme value ; and the importance of his witness to the primacy of the Roman Church can hardly be exaggerated.

The famous passage which particularly bears on our subject occurs in his Third Book, *Against Heresies* (*c.* 180). He is combating Gnosticism—that multiform heresy which combined in varying measure Revealed with Hellenic religion.

The apostles, the Gnostics pretended, did not know all ; and if they did know all, they did not teach all ; and if they did teach all, their teaching had been altered by the Churches.[78]

And these assertions Irenæus, like Tertullian,[79] here refutes. His argument runs somewhat as follows :

The Gnostics are little moved that the Scripture cut away the ground under them. They deny its authority. They claim to have an esoteric oral tradition of their own, which they justify by the words of S. Paul (I Cor. ii, 6) : " We speak wisdom among the perfect, yet a wisdom not of this world." " But," writes Irenæus, " when, on the other hand, we challenge them to that tradition which is of the apostles, which is guarded by the successions of presbyters in the Churches, they oppose tradition, saying that themselves, being wiser not only than presbyters, but even than apostles, have discovered the genuine Truth. For ' the apostles,' they say, intermingled with the words of the Saviour the things of the Law : and not only the apostles, but the Lord also Himself framed His discourses, now as from the Creator, now as from the middle state, now again from the highest ; while themselves know the hidden mystery

did not deliver to thee. For when I was a boy I saw thee in lower Asia with Polycarp, moving in splendour in the royal court, and endeavouring to gain his approbation. I remember the events of that time more clearly than those of recent years. For what boys learn growing with their mind becomes joined with it ; so that I am able to describe the very place in which the blessed Polycarp sat as he discoursed, and his goings out and his comings in, and the manner of his life, and his physical appearance, and his discourses to the people, and the accounts which he gave of his intercourse with John and with the others who had seen the Lord. And as he remembered their words and what he heard from them concerning the Lord and concerning His miracles and His teaching, having received them from eyewitnesses of ' the Word of Life,' Polycarp related all things in harmony with the Scriptures. These things being told me by the mercy of God, I listened to them attentively, noting them down, not on paper, but in my heart. And continually through God's mercy, I recall them faithfully."

[78] See Art., " Gnosticisme," *D.T.C.*, vol. vi, p. 1434, *seq.* by G. Bareille.

[79] *P. L.*, ii, 34.

without doubt, stain or admixture, which surely is most shameless blasphemy towards their Maker. It results, therefore, that they agree neither with Scriptures nor with tradition."[80]

To all this " fine fairy-tale " he opposes the constant tradition of the apostles made manifest in all the world. We can recount, he avers, those whom the apostles appointed bishops in the Churches and their successors right down to the present time. Certainly, he urges, if the apostles had known any hidden mysteries which they used to teach " the perfect " they would have delivered it to those, even more than others, to whom they were entrusting the Churches themselves. For they would have those who were to fulfil the office of their successors and to whom they were committing their Presidency very perfect and blameless, since their good conduct would be a great advantage, and their failure an extreme calamity.

And then comes the *locus classicus :*

> " But because it were very long in such a work as this to reckon up the successions in all the Churches, there is one, very great, and most ancient and known to all, the Church founded and established at Rome by two most glorious apostles Peter and Paul, whose tradition which it hath from the apostles, and her faith proclaimed unto men by succession of bishops coming down even unto us, we point to, thereby confounding all those, who in any way form undue assemblies, on account of self-pleasing ways, or of vain glory, or of blindness and wrong opinion. For with this Church, on account of its higher original, the whole Church (I mean the faithful on all sides) must needs agree ; wherein the tradition which is of the apostles hath ever been preserved by them of all countries.
>
> " The blessed apostles, then, having founded and builded the Church, committed the ministry of the episcopate to Linus."

Irenæus then gives a list of the names of all the bishops up to his time, and thus concludes :

> " The bishop's office is now held, in the twelfth place from the apostles by Eleutherius. By the same order, and in the same succession, both the tradition from the apostles in the Church and the preaching of the truth hath come down to us. And this is a very full demonstration of the unity and sameness of the life-giving faith, which from the apostles

[80] *Iren.*, iii, 2, 2. *Oxford Library of the Fathers*, p. 205.

even until now hath been preserved in the Church and passed onward in the truth."[81]

The ultimate criterion of the truth is to ask what particular Churches, which make up the Universal Church, teach, and especially those which are ruled by pastors whose succession goes back to an apostle. But this would take too long. It suffices then to examine what is the teaching of the Roman Church. " *En elle et par elle,*" so Tixeront explains the last sentence of the Latin, " *les fidèles partout dispersés ont conservé la tradition venue des apôtres.*"[82]

If only we possessed the Greek original instead of the somewhat equivocal and enigmatical Latin version a vast amount of controversial and polemical writing would have been spared. For the literature on Irenæus is enormous.

Sed quoniam valde longum est in hoc tali volumine omnium Ecclesiarum enumerare successiones, maximae et antiquissimae *et omnibus cognitae, a* gloriosissimis duobus apostolis Petro et Paulo Romae fundatae et constitutae Ecclesiae, *eam quam habet ab apostolis traditionem et annuntiatam hominibus fidem, per successiones episcoporum pervenientem usque ad nos indicantes, confundimus omnes eos qui, quoquo modo, vel per sibi placentiam vel vanam gloriam vel per caecitatem et malam sententiam, praeterquam oportet colligunt.*

Ad hanc enim Ecclesiam, propter potentiorem principalitatem necesse est omnem convenire Ecclesiam, *hoc est eos qui sunt undique fideles,* in qua *semper ab his* qui sunt undique *conservata est ea quae est ab apostolis traditio.*

The Latin, ambiguous, obscure or involved, demands a few remarks.

" *Antiquissimae* " cannot mean " most ancient," for Irenæus himself speaks of the Church of Jerusalem as the oldest Christian Church, as of course it was.[83] " Very ancient " would be a

[81] *Irenæus,* C. Haer., iii, 3, 3. I give the extract as it is translated by Keble in the *Oxford Library of the Fathers ;* not because I think it is the best rendering, but to avoid over-much controversy ; and also because, even translated thus, it teaches the supreme position, the primacy of the Roman Church.

[82] Tixeront, *Histoire des Dogmes, t.* i, p. 251. With this cf. the translation which Bossuet makes of the passage in his sermon on the unity of the Church. *Œuvres t.* xi, p. 610 : " *C'est avec cette Eglise que toutes les Eglises et tous les fidèles, qui sont par toute la terre, doivent s'accorder, à cause de sa principale et excellente principauté, et . . . . c'est en elle que ces mêmes fidèles répandus par toute la terre ont conservé la tradition qui vient des apôtres.*"

[83] iii, 12.

suitable and sufficient translation. It has been suggested[84] that the original Greek was ἀρχαιοτάτης, badly translated by *antiquissimae* instead of *praecipuae ac principis*.

"*Petro et Paulo*," need not detain us long, except to point out that here is an early evidence of the founding of the Roman Church by Peter, and personally I consider the phrase the key to the whole passage.[85] Bishop Gore has no right to say, "S. Irenæus regards the Roman Church as having been founded *concurrently and equally* by S. Peter and S. Paul."[86] Their work at Rome was not equal; and it certainly was not concurrent (see, for instance, Rom. xv, 20). Irenæus is giving a list of the Bishops of Rome. He is treating of the witness of Churches which trace their foundation to an apostle. But in the case of the Roman Church she is the depositary, not of one, but of two apostles, and the greatest and most important.[87]

As regards the words *necesse est*, F. X. Roiron[88] has pointed out that they may be explained in three ways: (a) a "logical necessity"[89]—if on all sides a unique tradition has been received and guarded, it will be particularly necessary that one should be in agreement, or (b) "physical," "material"; the point would not be what one has the duty to do, but what the force of things imposes, or (c) "moral."[90]

Convenire can be taken either in the sense of "to agree" or "to resort to." Personally I think it means "to agree

[84] *P. G.*, vii, 278. Massult *Dissert.*, iii, a, 4, n. 31, and cf. *Iren.*, ii, 5, 4. Origen (see Eusebius, *H. E.*, vi, 14) uses the same expression of the Church of Rome, and see A. Stieren *S. Irenæus, I.* p. 428.

[85] cf. Tertullian's words: "How happy that Church into which the apostles poured forth all their faith with their blood." *De Praescr.*, 36.

[86] *Roman Catholic Claims*, p. 93. *v.* Marini, chap. xv, *Il Primato*, and Chapman, *Op. cit.*

[87] It is only just to give Bishop Gore's explanation of the passage. "Rome was the centre of the world's movements. Everybody came thither. She was the world's 'microcosm' . . . . Christians from all parts necessarily gravitated thither. . . . Thus it was that the testimony of the Roman Church had a 'microcosmic' character; and when Irenæus wants to select a typical Western Church in order to enumerate the succession of her bishops and 'confound' the Gnostics with her creed, he chooses as a specimen, because it would be tedious to enumerate the succession of all the Churches, the Church of Rome." *Roman Claims*, p. 96. But the whole context to my mind is contrary to this. It is the succession of the tradition from Peter and Paul which Irenæus is stressing. cf. Chapman, *Op. cit.*, p. 64.

[88] In a posthumous article in *Recherches de Science religieuse* (Paris, 1917), *t.* vii, p. 36, *seq.*

[89] And so Batiffol, *L'Eglise Naissante*, p. 250.

[90] With this cf. Albert Dufourcq, *Saint Irénée* (Paris, 1904), p. 116, note 3. "*On s'accorde généralement à reconnaître que l'expression* necesse est *implique l'idée, non d'obligation morale, mais de nécessité physique; en d'autres termes, Irénée n'entend pas ici exposer quel est le devoir des Eglises*

with,"[91] but really there is a good deal to be said for Dom Chapman's contention that it is " a distinction without a difference," for in the end it comes to the same thing—they go, they apply to Rome to find out the tradition. And " to resort to," which non-Roman Catholics generally prefer, is, in a sense, as Batiffol points out,[92] a stronger term, as implying an active step taken to find out the Truth.

But what Irenæus goes on to say, immediately after this passage, of S. Clement and of his letter to the Corinthians is obviously an example of what he means—the constant rôle attributed in general to the Roman Church. The Corinthians did not come to Rome, but the Roman Church, *reparans fidem eorum et annuntians quam in recenti ab apostolis acceperat traditionem*, preserved the agreement of their belief with hers.

Potentiorem principalitatem. We do not know the Greek word. It is impossible to know whether it was αὐθεντία, as Harnack,[93] or πρωτεῖα,[94] or ἡγεμονία (words which Irenæus uses in other places), or ἀρχή. All the apostolic Churches have the *principalitas* (Iren. IV, 26, 2). What distinguishes the Roman Church is the fact that the *principalitas* is *potior*.[95]

In qua can refer to *omnem Ecclesiam* or to *ad hanc Ecclesiam* (the Roman Church), and then in this last case several senses are possible.

For myself I think it refers to the Roman Church.[96] But

mais décrire leur attitude ; il faut que les églises s'accordent avec l'église romaine, c'est un fait."

[91] And so Harnack (*Hist. of Dog.*, vol. ii, p. 158) : " *Convenire* is probably to be understood in its derived meaning ; the literal and therefore more obvious sense, ' every Church must go to the Roman Church,' is scarcely possible." Funk prefers " to resort to " (*Kirchengesch. Abhandl.*, i, 15–21).

[92] See *L'Eglise Naissante*, p. 250, and see the note at the foot of p. 48, a quotation from Renan's Hibbert Lecture.

[93] *Hist. of Dog.*, i.

[94] *L'Eglise Naissante*, p. 252.

[95] A. Dufourcq, *S. Irénée*, p. 117, note 3, remarks : " *De ce texte rapprocher le texte fameux de saint Ignace d'Antioche sur l'église romaine ' qui préside sur toute la fraternité,' l'intervention de Saint Clément de Rome dans les affaires de Corinthe, et surtout le rôle de Saint Pierre*, avant même sa venue à Rome *d'après les Actes des Apôtres.*"

The passage of *Irenæus* obliges all the faithful of the entire world to conform their belief to the belief of the Roman Church, and only the Roman Church has the prerogative. It is a practical functioning primacy. If it were not, Irenæus, himself a child of the Church of Smyrna, a disciple of the disciples of an apostle, S. John, would be content that his readers should put themselves in agreement with the Churches of Smyrna and Ephesus, of which he speaks immediately afterwards. But the *faithful of the whole world, omnem Ecclesiam*, including those of Smyrna and Ephesus, must " *convenire* " with or to the Church of Rome.

[96] So Batiffol, *L'Eglise Naissante*, p. 251 ; but Harnack, Funk and Duchesne think it refers to " *omnem Ecclesiam*," the Church at large.

it really makes little difference in the end which way you take it.

The phrase "*qui sunt undique*" occurs twice. Fr. d'Herbigny in a very interesting article[97] has proposed the rather attractive and ingenious solution that the second "*qui sunt undique*" is a copyist's error for "*qui sunt undecim.*" But the suggested emendations which Dom Morin has described as "*fort vraisemblables*" have apparently found few followers. Fr. d'Herbigny suggests that "*qui sunt undecim* was the original text of the Latin version, because Irenæus is going to name the *eleven* bishops of Rome who have succeeded since Peter and he will terminate his list by these words (col. 851), "*nunc duodecimo loco* (νῦν δωδεκάτῳ τόπῳ) *episcopatum ab apostolis habet Eleutherus.*"[98]

Dom Morin himself had already written an article on the repetition[99] and his explanation, which is the very generally accepted one, is that the second "*qui sunt undique*" is due to a clumsy mistake of the copyist whose eye fell on the words in the preceding line.

Tout porte à croire, que le second sunt undique *est une répétition maladroite de celui qui se lit une ligne auparavant. Il est possible, probable même, que ces deux mots en ont remplacé d'autres désignant d'une façon quelconque les chefs d'Eglise ceux dont l'action vigilante assura la conservation de la tradition apostolique au sein de la communauté romaine.*" Such words might be *qui ibi praefuerunt.*

In whatever way one renders the passage—even as a "minimiser"—it can only mean that this Eastern Father lays down as an indisputable fact that all the other churches must take the doctrine of the Church of Rome as the test of the soundness of their own doctrine.

Certainly there is nothing in the passage which even remotely affords support to the theory of Harnack and the Protestant school that it is the situation of the Church in the capital of

[97] See *Revue Bénédictine* (1910), p. 103, *seq.* "Sur le Second *qui sunt Undique* dans Irénée," iii, 3, 2.

[98] The conclusion of Fr. d'Herbigny's article giving his suggestions is worth recording:

Texte original ΤΙΙΕΠΩΝΟΝΤΩΝΙΑ.
Corruption ΤΙΩΝΟΝΤΩΝΙΑ (ου ΤΙΟΤΩΝ).
Traduction primitive, ab his qui sunt undecim.
Correction dernière, ab his qui sunt undique.

cf. *Irenæus*, iii, 3, 3, for a parallelism to the interpretation given in the text.

[99] *Revue Bénédictine* (1908). "Une erreur de copiste dans le texte d'Irénée sur l'Eglise romaine," and Mgr. Batiffol, *L'Eglise Naissante*, p. 251, who cordially welcomes this explanation.

the empire that gives it its importance and authority. The words cannot be made to mean it. The theory itself is unhistorical.

It is not till after the founding of Constantinople that the idea arises, even in the East, that the Roman primacy was simply the outcome of the city's political rank. Such a theory was quite unknown in the period covered by the first part of this dissertation.[100] And Funk is perfectly right when, concluding his discussion of this so controverted portion of Irenæus, he writes: " In any case, the passage says that all the other Churches must resort to or agree with the Roman Church on account of her superior rank, or on account of her greater primitiveness, or on account of her surpassing antiquity, or on account of her greater pre-eminent authority, and consequently this passage, whichever interpretation we give to it, is a testimony to her supremacy."

To repeat—the only points I have been at pains to emphasise in this discussion on Irenæus are that indisputably the passage teaches the primacy of the Roman Church, and that that primacy has nothing to do with the greatness of the city.[101]

As a matter of fact I think the passage teaches more, and that the deductions drawn from it by Roman Catholic scholars in the extracts from their writings, which I have put in the Appendix V, have something to be said for them.

But here I would recall words of Prof. Bigg quoted above (p. 5): " Church history is a stream of development, and it is not possible to draw a line across it at any point and say that what comes before that line is sound and what comes after it is corrupt." When we come to the Council of Ephesus I shall maintain that the papacy was there allowed to be *de jure divino*, and though indeed Ephesus is a long time after Irenæus I should say (if it be indeed the case that the papacy is seen and recognised at Ephesus as of " divine " and not merely of ecclesiastical institution) that that fact casts light back on the interpretation of Irenæus here.

However, I have no desire to do more now than to use Irenæus as a step in the discussion—simply as a witness to the leadership of Rome because of the soundness of her faith—and I am content with Duchesne's summing up of the evidence: " It would be difficult to meet with a clearer assertion (1) of

[100] cf. Funk, *Manual of Ch. Hist.*, vol. i, 60.

[101] F. W. Puller tries to maintain this, however. See *Primitive Saints and the See of Rome*, pp. 19–35. cf. Gore, *Roman Catholic Claims*, p. 97. Also Langen, *Geschich. der rom. Kirche*, i, 172.

unity of doctrine in the Universal Church, (2) of the unique importance of the Church of Rome as witness, guardian and organ of the apostolic tradition, (3) of her superior pre-eminence over the whole of Christianity."[102]

. . . . . .

Illustration of this "*convenire ad*" and "*Potentiorem principalitatem*" is supplied by the example of Hegesippus (110–180) a Christian Jew of Palestine and the earliest historian of Christianity, who, like other great figures of early Church life—whether orthodox or heretics—apparently made it a point to visit Rome.[103]

It is most convenient to quote the whole passage from Eusebius recording this visit of Hegesippus, for it also bears on other points already discussed, e.g. his enquiry as to the doctrine held by another "apostolic" Church, that of Corinth, when he was *en route* to Rome to make his investigations specially there.

> "Hegesippus in the five books of Memoirs[104] which have come down to us has left a most complete record of his own views. In them he states that on a journey to Rome he met a great many bishops, and that he received the same doctrine from all. It is fitting to hear what he says after making some remarks about the epistle of Clement to the Corinthians. His words are as follows: 'And the Church of Corinth continued in the true faith until Primus was bishop in Corinth. I conversed with them on my way to Rome, and abode with the Corinthians many days, during which we were mutually refreshed in the true doctrine. And when I had come to Rome I remained there until Anicetus, whose deacon was Eleutherus. And Anicetus was succeeded by Soter, and he by Eleutherus. In every succession and in every city that is held which is preached by the law of the prophets and the Lord.'"[105]

Why was it that heretics made this visit? It is not only d'Herbigny who points out that the heretics Marcion, Marcia, Cerdon, Valentinus, Theodotus of Byzantium, Montanus, Praxeas and the Montanists knew that it was worth while to make the effort to "capture" Rome.[106] It is the Protestant

[102] *Churches Separated*, p. 80. See also Appendix III.

[103] See Lightfoot, *Ignatius and Polycarp*, part ii, vol. ii, p. 435.

[104] Except for a few fragments in Eusebius and Photius these books of Hegesippus have disappeared.

[105] Eusebius, *H. E.*, iv, 22.

[106] *Theologica de Ecclesia*, ii, 298, 2, and Hergenröther, *Anti-Janus*, p. 109. cf. Milman, *Hist. Lat. Chris.*, vol. i, book i, chap. i, pp. 38–9:

Caspari who has compiled a list of them, who remarks : " They desired besides (*sc.* making converts) to gain importance in the great highly thought of and very influential Church community of the capital of the world, and, indeed, partly to obtain recognition from her, in order thereby to get easier access elsewhere, and to be enabled to spread with more force. The dignity of the Church of Rome was to cover them in their efforts ; she was, so to speak, to stamp them with the hall-mark of Christianity and Catholicity, or orthodoxy."[107]

The heretics deem it worth while to visit Rome, but Rome condemns and excommunicates them. And then the orthodox, like Hegesippus above and Abercius of Hierapolis in Phrygia[108] (whose well-known epitaph is of such importance in this connection), Polycarp from Smyrna, Justin Martyr coming twice from Syria ; and possibly, Tatian,[109] when still Catholic, and his pupil Rhodon, visit Rome too.

" Rome," says Harnack, " is the object of the most part of Christians whom we know as travellers." He gives in support of this a list of more than twenty-five prominent Christians who came from most distant places to visit the Roman Church during the second and third centuries. He gives too a list of letters written by the popes to distant Churches, and adds : " Indeed, up to the time of Constantine and, at all events, up to the middle of the third century, centripetal tendencies were stronger than centrifugal tendencies. But Rome was the centre of these tendencies. The Roman community was the Catholic, she was not only the symbol and personification (*die Repraesentantin*) of unity, but it is to her above all that one owes unity " (*ihr vor allem verdankt man die Einheit*).[110]

" In Rome, every heresy, almost every heresiarch found welcome reception . . . . They were all strangers and foreigners ; not one of all the systems originated in Rome, in Italy, or in Africa. On all these opinions the Bishop of Rome was almost compelled to sit in judgment ; he must receive or reject, authorise or condemn ; he was a proselyte whom it would be the ambition of all to gain."

[107] *Quellen zur Geschichte des Tauf-Symbols*, vol. iii, p. 309, *seq.*

[108] Lightfoot says, " We shall naturally interpret the queen as denoting the Roman Church" (*Ignatius and Polycarp*, i, 498–9). cf. Paul Allard, *Le Christianisme et l'Empire Romain*, pp. 53, 84. It has, however, been disputed by some whether the inscription is a Christian epitaph. Duchesne thinks that he was Bishop of Hierapolis.

[109] cf. Lightfoot, *Ignatius and Polycarp*, part ii., vol. 2, p. 436.

[110] *Die Mission und Ausbreitung*, pp. 269–272 : ". . . . All the elements of the further evolution of the constitution of the Church are ready by the end of the second century and even earlier, and no new factors will be introduced except the advent of the Christian emperor. Even the working primacy of Rome at that period cannot be denied." cf. Harnack, *Entstehung und Entwickelung der Kirchenverfassung* (1920), pp. 118-119.

It has already been noted (p. 31) that Kattenbusch has demonstrated that the rule of faith, in which all Catholicity was united, originated in Rome and is equivalent to the Roman baptismal symbol. Sohm has set out his arguments to establish that the monarchical episcopate owes its genesis to Rome, and with it all the *Kirchenrecht*. Of all the great questions which arose in the second and third centuries he writes that " they found at Rome their solution for the Church," and that " Rome is the head of the Church and that without her the Church is no longer the Church," that " it is only by their union with Rome that individual communities belong to the Church " ; and that " these convictions of the ancient Catholic Church alone account for the prodigious power of the Roman community in face of all other communities." [111] While Renan's words are, apart from the date, approved by Harnack, " *Si nous comparons le Christianisme, tel qu'il existait vers l'an* 180, *au Christianisme du IVme et Vme siècles, au Christianisme du moyen âge, au Christianisme de nos jours, nous trouvons qu'en réalité il s'est augmenté de très peu de chose dans les siècles qui ont suivis.*"

. . . . .

For some time there had been considerable agitation in the Church as to the date proper for keeping Easter.

The Christians of the province of Asia, following, they said, the example of the Apostle S. John, kept it on the 14th of Nisan—the date i.e. of Christ's death—whatever day of the week that chanced to be. The Westerns and the greater part of the Church kept it on the Sunday following the 14th Nisan (i.e. the first full moon after the vernal equinox), because Christ rose on that day.

The question was discussed by Polycarp, the disciple of S. John, with Anicetus, Bishop of Rome (c. 157–168) as Eusebius thus records :

> "And when the blessed Polycarp was at Rome (ἐπιδημήσαντος τῇ Ῥώμῃ) in the time of Anicetus and they disagreed a little about certain other things, they immediately made peace with one another, not caring to quarrel over this matter. For neither could Anicetus persuade Polycarp not to observe what he had always observed with John the disciple of our Lord, and the other apostles with whom he had associated ; neither could Polycarp persuade Anicetus to observe it, as he said that he ought to follow the customs of the presbyters

[111] *Kirchenrecht*, i (1892), pp. 382–3. See also Appendix (VI), the *précis* I have made of Harnack's reasons for the Roman primacy.

> that had preceded him. But though matters were in this shape, they communed together, and Anicetus conceded the administration of the Eucharist in the Church to Polycarp, manifestly as a mark of respect. And they parted from each other in peace, both those who observed and those who did not, maintaining the peace of the whole Church."[112]

This visit would be somewhere between 160 and 162.

Bishop Lightfoot remarks : " They had other points of difference to discuss, but one main subject of their conference was the time of celebrating the Passion."[113] And it seems to me rather captious—the criticism which is made by some—when they point out that the Paschal question was not the sole question discussed in these " Conversations " of Anicetus and Polycarp.

" Anicetus did not go to the aged Polycarp, but he to Anicetus," remarks Harnack. And when one looks at the map and considers his age—he was over 80—it seems to be a sensible observation.[114]

Aequatio vero eo magis significat, quo Anicetus, gente Syrus ex Emesa, non nativitatis praxim sed Romanam praefert Joanneae, eamque primum sub excommunicationis poena, praecipere volebat, maintains Prof. d'Herbigny.[115] But the Eastern origin of Anicetus is questioned by some.[116] Undoubtedly if he was indeed a Syrian his urgent preference for the Western custom would be a marked evidence of the primacy of Rome.

[112] Eusebius, *H. E.*, vol. xxiv. cf. *Irenæus*, Haer., iii, 3, 4.

[113] *Ignatius and Polycarp*, pt. ii, vol. i, p. 433. cf. A. Dufourcq, *Saint Irénée*, p. 53.

[114] Dr. Brightman characterised it as " a very foolish remark." I notice that Batiffol, on the other hand, considers it very pertinent. See his footnote 3, p. 250, *L'Eglise Naissante.*

[115] *Theologica de Ecclesia*, ii, 296, 5, B.

[116] Dr. Brightman disputes the Syrian nationality of Anicetus. Dom. J. Chapman writes to me (June 12, 1925) : " The statement that Pope Anicetus was a Syrian rests upon the authority of the Felician Catalogue. This has little authority. I should certainly not accept it as evidence."

I observe that Anicetus' Eastern nationality is taken for granted in the letter *Praeclara Gratulationis* of Leo XIII (1894) to the separated Eastern Churches when inviting them to reunion. The pope writes : "Many of these latter (—the Roman pontiffs) in the first ages of the Church were chosen from the East, and foremost among them Anacletus, Evaristus, *Anicetus*, Eleutherius, Zosimus and Agatho. . . ." In the list of popes given in the official *Gierarchia Cattolica* of 1904, Anicetus appears as a Syrian of Emesa. It is so quoted by Fr. Thurston in his English Edition of *The Book of the Popes*, from the German of F. J. Bayer, published by Methuen (London, 1925). The list in the *Gierarchia* is probably based on the *Liber Pontificalis*, edited by Duchesne. I imagine the list which appears in the *Almanach Catholique Français* for 1926, compiled by I. Cristiani, *Professeur d'Histoire aux Facultés catholiques de Lyon*, is also based on the same authority.

Forty years later Victor is Bishop of Rome, and the controversy enters on an acute stage. A series of councils from Gaul to Edessa is held to bring agreement of observance.

From the letter of Polycrates, Bishop of Ephesus, recorded in Eusebius[116a] it is apparent that these councils were convened at the request or instance of the pope οὕς ὑμεῖς ἠξιώσατε μετακληθῆναι ὑπ' ἐμοῦ. And it would appear that the Asiatic Council itself, a council of bishops unfavourable to the Roman custom in the matter, was summoned at the request of Victor, though the result was quite different from what, presumably, he hoped, for the Easterns obstinately clung to their old custom of observing the Feast.[117]

Victor now threatened the intransigent Eastern Churches with excommunication.

> "Thereupon Victor, who presided over the Church at Rome, immediately attempted to cut off from the common unity (τῆς κοινῆς ἑνώσεως) the parishes of Asia, with the Churches that agreed with them as heterodox; and he wrote letters and declared all the brethren there wholly excommunicate."[118]

There is no proof that Victor actually did excommunicate the Asiatic Churches.[119] But the point to remember is that the claim to be able to excommunicate Apostolic Churches is made and is not contested. It is the expediency of doing so which is questioned, for Eusebius proceeds:

"But this did not please all the bishops." (Parenthetically one may remark that it evidently commended itself to many.) But to continue:

> "And they besought him to consider things of peace and of neighbourly unity and love. Words of theirs are extant sharply rebuking Victor. Among them was Irenæus, who, sending letters in the name of the brethren in Gaul over whom he presided, maintained that the mystery of the resurrection of the Lord should be observed only on the Lord's day. He fittingly admonishes Victor that he should not cut off whole Churches of God which observed the tradition of an ancient custom."[120]

Bishop Lightfoot is severe on pope Victor and his dealing

[116a] Eusebius, *H.E.* v, 24.
[117] *ibid.*
[118] *ibid.*
[119] But cf. Socrates, *H. E.*, v, 22.
[120] Eusebius, *H. E.*, v, 24.

with the Quartodecimans. Victor became pope c. 190. Of him Dr. Lightfoot writes : " There is all the difference in the world between the attitude of Rome towards other Churches at the close of the first century, when the Romans as a community remonstrate *on terms of equality* with the Corinthians on their irregularities, strong only in the righteousness of their cause, and feeling, as they had a right to feel, that these counsels of peace were the dictation of the Holy Spirit, and its attitude at the close of the second century, when Victor the bishop excommunicates the Churches of Asia Minor for clinging to a usage in regard to the celebration of Easter which had been handed down to them from the apostles, and thus foments instead of healing dissensions. Even this second stage has carried the power of Rome only a very small step in advance towards the assumptions of a Hildebrand or an Innocent or a Boniface or even a Leo ; but it was nevertheless a decided step."[121]

On this one ought to recall that the bishop has described the letter of Clement to the Corinthians as " *peremptory,*" and " *almost imperious,*" etc.,[122] characterisations which seem hardly the same as " *terms of equality* " !

Bishop Lightfoot evidently looks on Victor as the first real " pope." He describes him[123] as " the first who advanced those claims to universal dominion which *his successors* in later ages have *always consistently* and often successfully *maintained*. . . . At the end of the first century the Roman Church was swayed by the mild and peaceful counsels of the presbyter-bishop Clement. The close of the second witnessed the autocratic pretensions of the haughty Pope Victor, the prototype of a Hildebrand or an Innocent."

It is well here, therefore, to compare Harnack's much more reasoned judgment of Victor's action with Lightfoot's. " How could Victor have ventured on issuing such an edict (powerless though he was to enforce it universally) if it were not established and recognised that to fix the conditions of the common unity in decisive questions of faith belonged chiefly to the Roman Church ? How could Victor have made such an unheard-of demand on autonomous communities, if he, a Roman bishop, were not recognised as in a special sense the guardian of that common unity."[124]

[121] *Clem. Rom.*, i, 70.
[122] See above, p. 18.
[123] *Dissertations*, 186.
[124] Harnack, *History of Dogma*, ii. Victor was not simply carried away by his " haughtiness "—he did not act utterly thoughtlessly. " *Ce désaccord liturgique, d'abord toléré, parut dangereux au pape Victor, à*

But Irenæus, who, as Eusebius pertinently remarks[125] "truly was well named," became a peacemaker in this matter.

Undoubtedly Irenæus protests with a certain warmth and vehemence. He and those with him consider the punishment too severe, for it appeared to them not a question of faith or morals, but simply a liturgical question. But he never denies Victor's primacy and right—he only questions the expediency and opportuneness of its exercise then. He, the disciple of Polycarp, attached by his upbringing to the Eastern custom, yet ranges himself with the party of the pope, and in the very letter to the bishops in which he protests against the appropriateness of the pope's sentence (it never enters his mind to question the power of Victor to excommunicate) he urges them to keep the Feast as Victor wishes.

This is indeed a recognition of Primacy, and Duchesne may well ask : " How do people wish us to speak if they forbid us to designate by the name of Head of the Church the depositary of such an authority ? "[126]

It is best to give Eusebius' own account[127] of the letters which

raison des interprétations judaïsantes hérétiques, auxquelles il donnait lieu de la part de certains asiates établis à Rome." Hugueny, *Critique et Catholique, t.* i, p. 141.

[125] Eusebius, *H. E.*, v, 24. His name in Greek would be Εἰρηναῖος from *εἰρήνη*.

[126] *Churches Separated.* I certainly think the comments of the Roman Catholic writer Dr. Rivington are valid when he says : " Had any other portion of the Church talked of cutting off whole Churches from the common unity, it would have only made itself ridiculous. But when the threat comes from Rome, the whole Church is astir, and there is one thing that no one says ; neither Saint Irenæus nor the rest of the bishops said, ' It is ridiculous. You have no such authority,' but they exhort and protest, and warn and entreat him not to do so." *Primitive Church and the See of Peter*, p. 9. As Renan says, this incident is a proof that " *la papauté était déjà née et bien née.*" *Marc Aurèle*, p. 201.

[127] *H. E.*, v. 24.

And note the admission regarding Irenæus and the Roman primacy made by the same Rationalist writer in his Hibbert Lecture (London, 1880. Eng. trans., p. 172–4) : " Rome was the place in which the great idea of Catholicity was worked out. More and more every day it became the capital of Christianity, and took the place of Jerusalem as the religious centre of humanity. Its Church claimed a precedence over all others, which was generally recognised. All the doubtful questions which agitated the Christian conscience came to Rome to ask for arbitration, if not decision. Men argued—certainly not in a very logical way—that as Christ had made Cephas the cornerstone of His Church, the privilege ought to be inherited by his successors. . . . The Bishop of Rome became the Bishop of bishops, he who admonished all others. Rome proclaims her right—a dangerous right—of excommunicating those who do not walk step by step with her. . . . At the end of the second century we can already recognise, by signs which it is impossible to mistake, the spirit which in 1870 will proclaim the infallibility of the pope. . . ."

" *Irenæus* (Lib. iii, 3) refutes all heresies by reference to the belief of this Church, the greatest, the oldest, the most illustrious, which possesses, in

Irenæus sent " in the name of the brethren in Gaul over whom he presided."

> " He maintained," notes Eusebius, " that the mystery of the resurrection of the Lord should be observed only on the Lord's day " ;

i.e. Irenæus demanded that the Easterns should follow the Roman custom.

Then Eusebius continues :

> " He fittingly admonishes Victor that he should not cut off whole churches of God which observed the tradition of an ancient custom."

Though Irenæus agreed with Victor as to the proper time for keeping Easter, he points out that the very variety of day or manner of the fast has its apologetic value. For whether people favoured one or the other he says :

" All of these lived none the less in peace, and we also live in peace with one another ; and the disagreement in regard to the fast confirms the agreement in the faith."

By the end of the third century the Roman custom prevailed ; for nothing is heard of Quartodecimans in Asia in the third and fourth centuries, though there is mention of some in the fifth. But at the Council of Nicæa we find the Asiatics supporters of the common custom.[128]

But to explore the ramifications and modifications of the Paschal question would take us too far afield from the subject of our special investigation.[129] This, however, in conclusion, may be said : the Paschal Question was the second of the great questions discussed at Nicæa. The outcome of the discussion was the solution that the custom which the Roman Church had followed was to be universal.

And thus, to that extent, anyhow, the Council justified the action of Pope Victor—this General Council showed that he was so far right.

. . . . .

virtue of an unbroken succession, the true tradition of the Apostles Peter and Paul, and to which, because of its primacy, all the rest of the Church ought to have recourse."

[128] Eusebius, *Vit. Const.*, iii, 17–20. Eusebius, v., 23 *seq.* Duchesne, *Origines chrét.*, p. 287.

[129] A learned and lucid article by Fernand Daunoy, dealing with Quartodecimans and Protopaschites under the title of " La Question Pascale au Concile de Nicée," has recently appeared in the *Echos d'Orient* for Oct.-Dec. 1925. See also Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des Conciles*, *t.* i, 1ère partie, p. 133 *seq. Conciles concernant la fête de Paques*, and p. 451 *seq. Solution de la question pascale.*

I am concerned in my investigation with evidence from *Eastern* sources only, as to the position and primacy and supremacy of the Bishop of Rome, and therefore I can only use the evidence of S. Cyprian in so far as he is concerned with Eastern affairs.

Now, the two controversies wherewith his name is particularly connected: the Novatian Schism at Rome, and the question of the re-baptism of heretics are matters in which the Eastern Churches are involved. From Eusebius VII, 5, we learn that *not only the West*, but Antioch, Tyre, Palestine, all Africa, Pontus and Bithynia, Cilicia and Cappadocia, Syria, Arabia and Egypt, were agitated because there were rival bishops at Rome. And it is in this connection that Cyprian speaks of Rome as "the Chair of Peter, the origin of the unity of the episcopate, to which heresy can have no access."[130]

But the second question is the more famous of the two. And it is of worth to find out from this controversy what claims are made by the pope, and whether these claims are recognised by the Easterns concerned.

Harnack, indeed, says that in this controversy with Pope Stephen, Cyprian was putting himself into contradiction with his former teaching.

"Stephen," writes Lightfoot, "inheriting the haughty temper and aggressive policy of his earlier predecessor, Victor, excommunicated those who differed from the Roman usage in this matter. These arrogant assumptions were directly met by Cyprian. He summoned first one and then another synod of African bishops, who declared in his favour. He had on his side also the Churches of Asia Minor, which had been included in Stephen's edict of excommunication. Thus the bolt hurled by Stephen fell innocuous, and the Churches of Africa and Asia retained their practice."

Now, there is no evidence that Stephen ever carried out his threat.[131] Tillemont, in fact, affirms: "The Roman Church

[130] Harnack, *Hist. of Dogma*, vol. ii, 88, thus describes S. Cyprian's conception of the primacy: "A special importance attaches itself to the Roman see, because it is the seat of the apostle to whom Christ first granted apostolic authority in order to show with unmistakable plainness the unity of these powers and the correspondency of the Church that rests on them; and further because, from her historical origin, the Church of this see had become the mother and root of the Catholic Church spread over the earth. In a severe crisis which Cyprian had to pass through in his own diocese he appealed to the Roman Church (the Roman bishop) in a manner which made it appear as if communion with that Church was in itself the guarantee of faith."

[131] *Quoi qu'on ait dit, Rome n'excommuniait encore aucune église, mais Rome parlait de rompre avec les églises qui ne reconnaîtraient pas la validité*

has always shown such great veneration for S. Cyprian, that there can be no doubt that he died in communion with her, not only through the disposition of his heart, but also through actual communion." Be this as it may; into the rights or wrongs of Cyprian's case it is not my province to enter. But the following points should be noted:

1. Pope Stephen claims to be able to cut off whole Churches in the East from Catholic unity.
2. He claims to be able to cancel the decisions of Councils—and important ones.
3. He claims to have authority and jurisdiction of some sort over the bishops of Africa and Asia Minor.
4. Apparently his right is not contested by them, but only the exercise of it then.

And the angry sarcastic letter of Firmilian,[132] the Bishop of Cæsarea (whether we approve of it or disapprove of it) states that the Bishop of Rome in this third century claimed that he " holds the succession of Peter, upon whom the foundations of the Church are laid " and that the pope " proclaims that he occupies by succession the Chair of Peter."

Pope Stephen claimed, therefore, to exercise a primacy which gave him a right over all the other bishops of the world.

And there is nothing to show that Firmilian himself did not accept these beliefs. Apparently he is annoyed, he sends forth his " violent philippic " because the pope fails to act in accordance with his claims, and support the re-baptism of heretics. Primarily the controversy was a question of discipline rather than of faith. " In any case," says Duchesne,[133] " the Africans saw in this dispute no reason for disunion, and forbore to disturb the concord of the Church. Moreover, neither they nor Firmilian denied the authority of the Apostolic See; but went only so far as to think and to affirm that the question contained an element of abuse."

du baptême hérétique." Batiffol, *ibid.*, p. 471. cf. his note on the same page: "*Cyprien dénonce là Etienne comme ayant pensé à excommunier les évêques de l'opposition, mais il n'a pas excommunié. Cette interprétation est confirmée par un passage de la lettre de Firmilien* (lxxv, 21) *et un passage d'une lettre de Denys d'Alexandrie* (Euseb., *H. E.*, vii, 5, 4).

[132] "*Atque ego in hac parte juste indignor ad hanc tam apertam et manifestam Stephani stultitiam, quod qui sic de episcopatus sui loco gloriatur et se successionem Petri tenere contendit, super quem fundamenta Ecclesiæ collocata sunt. . . . Stephanus qui per successionem cathedram Petri habere se praedicat.*" The letter of Firmilian, the genuineness of which has been wrongly questioned, exists only in a Latin translation incorporated in the collection of letters of S. Cyprian. See Tixeront, *Précis de Patrologie*, p. 135, and Bardenhewer-Shahan, *Patrology*, p. 175.

[133] *Churches Separated*, p. 98.

Everyone agrees that Cyprian and the Easterns were wrong in this matter and that the pope was right. The subsequent history of the Church shows it. The Œcumenical Council of Nicæa ruled with Stephen.[134]

. . . . .

At Antioch in the year 272 there arose a dispute among the Christians there relative to their bishop, Paul of Samosata. He was condemned for his adoptionist heresy, which combined a Sabellian view of the Godhead with a humanitarian conception of Christ.[135] The decision of the council of neighbouring bishops was addressed to the Bishops of Rome and Alexandria and sent to all the provinces.[136] But, relying on the support of Zenobia, the Queen of Palmyra, Paul took no notice of his condemnation and continued in possession of the bishop's house and church buildings, refusing to make way for the orthodox bishop who had been appointed to succeed him. Appeal was made to the Emperor Aurelian, and this pagan ruler decided that the building should be given over "to those to whom the bishops of Italy and of the city of Rome should adjudge it."[137]

It will be seen later (on p. 349) that Photius attributes the primacy of the Roman bishop to this act of the Emperor Aurelian.

This is the first example of an appeal from the "Greek" Church to an emperor on an ecclesiastical point. Too much need not be built on it either one way or the other. It seems a fairly obvious reply for the emperor to give.[138]

. . . . .

In his zealous combating of Sabellianism, Dionysius, the bishop of Alexandria, went too far and gave a handle to the Arians of after time in his dangerous teaching of the inferiority of the Eternal Word. Appeal was made to Rome. His namesake, Pope Dionysius, wrote the letter (quoted by Athanasius)[139] where the term ὁμοούσιος is justified and "the occupant of the greatest see after Rome came into line."

[134] The Council of Nicæa (c.19) refused to acknowledge the validity of the baptisms conferred by the Paulinists or followers of Paul of Samosata.

[135] Tixeront, *Histoire des Dogmes*, i, 429.

[136] Eusebius, vii, 30.

[137] *ibid.* cf. Batiffol, *L'Eglise Naissante*, p. 394, and note on p. 395. *Le fait est d'autant plus significatif que Rome n'était pas intervue dans la procédure contre Paul de Samosate et que le jugement de déposition avait été rendu par les seuls évêques d'Asie Mineure et de Syrie assemblés à Antioche. Paul, condamné, avait-il fait appel à Rome? La décision d'Aurélian fut-elle suggérée par les orthodoxes d'Antioche?*

[138] Duchesne, *Churches Separated*, p. 104.

[139] *De decretis Nicaenae Synodis*, 25. *De Sententia Dionysii*, 13. Coustant, *Epist. Rom. Pont.*, pp. 272–9. Hergenröther, *Anti-Janus*, p. 111.

The case of Origen, too, affords its witness to the supreme position of Rome. He goes to Rome, as he says, " filled with the desire of seeing the most ancient Church of the Romans." He became notorious for his novel and dangerous speculations.

" He wrote," says Eusebius, " also to Fabianus Bishop of Rome, and to many other rulers of the Churches concerning his orthodoxy."[140]

Apparently reports of his teaching were causing considerable uneasiness in Rome and it may be that Fabian had asked him some explanation.

Origen is a witness to the interpretation of " Rock " as signifying Peter. He calls him " that great foundation of the Church," " that most solid rock upon which Christ founded His Church."[140a] Bishop Gore (*Op. cit.* p. 86) lays stress on the following passage of Origen which, he evidently considers, not only proves that Origen knew of no inequality among the apostles, but also supports his contention (p. 85) that whatever leadership Peter had, retired " into the background with the spread and growth of the Church." " But if you think the whole Church built on Peter alone, what will you say of John the son of thunder, or each one of the apostles ? And are we to dare to say that the gates of hell shall not prevail against Peter only, but that against the other apostles and those who are perfect they shall prevail ? Are not the quoted words ' The gates of hell shall not prevail against it,' and, ' Upon this rock I will build my church ' said of them all, and of each

[140] Harnack has the following instructive note, *History of Dogma*, vol. ii, p. 164 : " In the case of Origen's condemnation the decision of Rome seems to have been of special importance. Origen sought to defend his orthodoxy in a letter written by his own hand to the Roman bishop, Fabian (see Euseb., *H. E.*, vi, 36 ; Jerome Ep. 84–10). The Roman bishop Pontianus had previously condemned him after summoning a senate ; see Jerome *Ep.* 33 (Döllinger, *Hippolytus and Calixtus*, p. 259). Further, it is an important fact that a deputation of Alexandrian Christians, who did not agree with the Christology of their Bishop, Dionysius, repaired to Rome, to the *Roman* Bishop, Dionysius, and formally accused the first-named prelate. It is also significant that Dionysius received this complaint and brought the matter up at a Roman synod. No objection was taken to this proceeding (Athanas, *De Synod*). This information is very instructive, for it proves that the Roman Church was ever regarded as specially charged with watching over the observance of the conditions of the general ecclesiastical federation, the κοινὴ ἑνώσις. As to the fact that in circular letters, not excepting Eastern ones, the Roman Church was put at the head of the address, see Euseb., *H. E.*, vii, 30. How frequently foreign bishops came to Rome is shown by the nineteenth canon of Arles (A.D. 314). *De episcopis peregrinis qui in urbem solent venire, placuit iis locum dari ut offerant.* The first canon is also important as deciding the special position of Rome."

[140a] *In Exod. Hom.* V, 4. Comment in *Ep. ad Rom. Lib.* V, n. 10.

single one of them? Are the keys of the kingdom of heaven given to Peter only, and shall no other one of the blessed men receive them? And if the words 'I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven' are common to the others, how are not all the words, said before and said after, said as they seem to be to Peter also common to the others? For in this place the words 'Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth,' etc., seem as if they were spoken to Peter. But in the Gospel of John, the Saviour's giving the Holy Spirit to the disciples by means of the Breath, says, 'Receive *ye* the Holy Ghost,'" etc. (In Matt. *t.* xii, 11.)

Now, this is obviously a mystical allegorical passage, in the style characteristic of Origen, and there is nothing contradictory to or inconsistent with what Origen has written about Peter in other places. Dom. Chapman in a note (*Op. cit.* p. 57) complains of "Dr. Gore's indefensible treatment of this passage." He is justified in doing so. "If Dr. Gore infers from this that Peter is not above the other Apostles, he must also infer that Peter is not above the perfect!"

In my judgment it is perfectly easy to see what Origen means. If, as Christ Himself says, a man who does His Will can be "His brother" or "His sister" or even "His mother"; if, as the old saying has it, one can be "*alter Christus*," it is obvious that one can be "*alter Petrus*."

And, anyhow, the passage must be read with other extracts from the same great writer dealing with Peter.[141]

. . . . .

One more instance will suffice. Theodotus, the tanner of Byzantium, interesting as the first member of the Byzantine Church whose name appears in ecclesiastical history, is condemned at Rome because of his heresy,[142] and Eusebius quotes from an anonymous author an edifying story that Natalius, a confessor who was "persuaded by them to allow himself to be chosen bishop of this heresy, with a salary to be paid by them of one hundred and fifty denarii a month," although vouchsafed several warning visions, did not repent himself until "he was scourged by the holy angels and punished severely through the entire night." The narrative continues:

> "Thereupon, having risen in the morning, he put on sackcloth and covered himself with ashes, and with great haste and tears he fell down before Zephyrinus, the bishop, rolling

[141] e.g. in Matt. c.xiii, n. 31.
[142] ap. Eusebius, v. 28.

at the feet, not only of the clergy, but also of the laity; and he moved with his tears the compassionate Church of the merciful Christ. And though he used much supplication and showed the welts of the stripes which he had received, yet scarcely was he taken back into communion."

CHAPTER III

THE SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY

"Thus under the influence of heavenly power, and with divine co-operation, the doctrine of the Saviour, like the rays of the sun, quickly illumined the whole world; and straightway, in accordance with the divine Scriptures, the voice of the inspired evangelists and apostles went forth through all the earth, and their words to the end of the world. In every city and village churches were quickly established, filled with a multitude of people like a replenished threshing-floor."[1]

In these picturesque terms does Eusebius describe the undoubtedly quick propagation of Christianity.[2]

For Christianity spread rapidly. It has been the theme of many apologists that ordinary explanations are not sufficient to account for its speedy dissemination.[3] The Acts of the Apostles record, as being witnesses of some of the wonderful events of Pentecost: "Parthians and Medes and Elamites and the dwellers in Mesopotamia," and from this one writer gathers that it is evident that towards the year 80 the Churches of the Græco-Roman world were aware of the existence of Christian communities in the far-distant countries of the East.[4]

One need not take literally such rhetorical hyperboles as those of Eusebius, of Justin Martyr, Tertullian and the rest of the great apologists;[5] but soon the language of the rhetorician became a reality. Christianity spread over the East from Antioch, and in no place did it make such marked progress as in the unique independent state of Osrhoene, whose capital was Edessa. A Christian Syriac literature is showing itself in the middle of the second century. When later (*c.* 190) the Paschal Question has to be faced sufficient bishops are in existence to hold a council. And further on, the king, Abgar, with all his court, embraces Christianity.

[1] Eusebius, *H. E.*, ii, 3.

[2] cf. Paul Allard, *Le Christianisme et l'Empire Romain*, p. 69: "*L'Orient et l'Occident chrétiens s'attirent et se pénétrent. C'est entre eux un échange ininterrompu d'hommes et d'idées.*"

[3] Paul Allard, *Dix leçons sur les martyrs*," p. 44; cf. Harnack, *Die Mission und Ausbreitung*, p. 346.

[4] cf. J. Labourt, *Le Christianisme dans l'Empire Perse*, p. 16.

[5] cf. Allard, *Op. cit.*, p. 70.

Edessa, the capital of this romantic little kingdom, was till the time of Constantine in the front rank of great towns as regards the profession and manifestation of the Christian Faith.[6] Five bishops attended the Council of Nicæa from Nisibis and other cities. From Edessa it was that the Faith was propagated through East Syria and Persia. One recalls the famous legend, recorded at length by Eusebius, of the letter of Abgar the Black to Jesus the Good Physician ; and of the picture of Christ that was sent to the king with the promise that Christ would despatch one of his disciples to heal him of his sickness. Addai is sent, the king is healed, numbers of his people and of Jews are converted. But before Addai dies, he consecrates Aggai as bishop to succeed him, and ordains Palût to be a priest.[7] Then the king also dies. But he is succeeded by a pagan who kills Aggai. There is therefore now no bishop in Edessa.

And this is where the point of interest for our discussion arises. The legend says that Palût goes to Antioch and is consecrated bishop by Serapion, Bishop of Antioch. "The Doctrine of Addai,"[8] which in its present form dates from the fourth century, says "*Serapion, Bishop of Antioch, himself also received the hand from Zephyrinus, Bishop of the City of Rome, from the succession of the hand of the priesthood of Simon Cephas, which he received from our Lord, who was there Bishop of Rome twenty-five years in the days of the Cæsar* (*sc. Nero*) *who reigned there thirteen years.*"

Of course, the tale is full of absurdities, contradictions and anachronisms, e.g. Serapion was a bishop in 190, and Zephyrinus did not become Bishop of Rome till 202, the year Serapion died.[9] Then, too, according to the legend, Addai was one of the Seventy. He therefore could not have been alive in 190 to consecrate a successor.

There *was* a Serapion, Bishop of Antioch, and it is quite possible that he was consecrated by a Bishop of Rome, but Dr. F. C. Burkitt is more likely correct when he suggests that the origin of the tradition lay in the wish of the later Church of Edessa to claim descent from Peter the chief of the apostles. Prof. Burkitt writes : "The general ecclesiastical meaning is

[6] cf. Batiffol, *L'Eglise Naissante*, p. 275 : "*le roi d'Edesse étant chrétien, le christianisme est là pour la première fois dans l'histoire une religion d'Etat.*"

[7] Eusebius, *H. E.*, i, 13.

[8] See Art., "Doctrine of Addai," in *Cath. Encycl.*, by J. Chapman. Note also that this Syriac document speaks of "the epistles of Paul which *Simon Peter sent us from the city of Rome.*"

[9] *Early Eastern Christianity*, p. 37.

of course, quite clear. It means that Palût was the accredited missionary of the great Church of the Roman Empire. *Palût was the child of Peter.*"[10]

"The early bishops of Edessa," he writes again, "must remain to us shadowy personages. . . . We can do little more than repeat that the names of Addai and Aggai represent the original Christianity of Edessa, a Christianity detached in spirit from that of the Greek-speaking Christians of the Roman empire; and that, on the other hand, with the name of Palût are associated the ideas of episcopal succession and the feeling for unity of the Church which is symbolised by the primacy of S. Peter."[11]

Now, Professor Burkitt holds that the Church of Edessa was particularly uncorrupted and primitive, and its theology free from the influence of Greek thought and philosophy; he emphasises that it was in fact intensely conservative.

Evidence is more than sufficient that Christianity was rooted there well before the end of the second century.[12]

And the Church of Edessa was in full communion with the other Churches, Roman or Greek, of the empire, though it was strongly opposed to the influence of Greek philosophy, as S. Ephraem in the fourth century, by his example, shows.

It was then, according to Dr. Burkitt, a markedly conservative Church, not only in practice, but in doctrine, *yet here, according to him, we see the anxiety to claim spiritual lineage from Rome and Peter.*[13]

The isolation and independence of this East Syrian church may not have been quite so marked as Dr. Burkitt thinks.[14]

[10] cf. also Chapman (Art. cit.), "The anxiety of the writer to connect the Edessene succession with Rome is interesting; its derivation from the Petrine See of Antioch does not suffice him."

[11] *Early Eastern Christianity*, p. 26.

[12] See Harnack, *Die Mission und Ausbreitung*.

[13] Other churches, he maintains, have manifestly moved away from their original constitutions. "We have a right privately to revise," he writes elsewhere, "the judgments of the Church, mainly because the Church of the second century was so far removed in spirit and in knowledge from the life of Judæa in Our Lord's day. . . . But if between the Church of the second century and the apostles there is a great gulf fixed, in what words are we to describe the difference between the Nicene and post-Nicene Church and primitive Christianity? Here all will acknowledge the vastness of the change. At the same time it may be said that the change was due to natural growth. The line that it took was, as a matter of fact, the historical development of Christianity. After all, the creeds are merely the formal ratification of the best theology of the great churchmen. The new constitution was, in fact, inevitable—like the promulgation of the pope's infallibility at a later day, long after the dogma had been a pious inference in the mind of the Roman communion." *Early Christianity Outside the Roman Empire*, p. 5.

[14] See e.g. *Early Eastern Christianity*, p. 4, *seq.*, etc.

Its position has sometimes been compared with that of the Ancient British Church at the coming of Augustine, when with Palût there came from Antioch closer touch with the great See of the West.

Up to the time of Constantinople I (381) the Catholic Church is comprised in three Patriarchates—Rome, Alexandria, Antioch: and though Antioch was somewhat remote, it would seem that Edessa would come under its jurisdiction, for Antioch gathered in all the "East,"[15] and it was to Antioch that Palût went for consecration; and in the East the reception of consecration meant the acknowledgment of jurisdiction.

Records are scanty about the early times of this Eastern Church, but in the fourth century two writers are prominent: Aphraates and Ephraem. And in the writings of these fathers of this so independent Church, one finds again the same significant dwelling on the primacy of Peter.

Aphraates, Bishop of the monastery of Mar Mattaï, who is generally called "the Persian Sage," was the first of the Syriac Fathers.

From what he says in his own writings, he appears to have been born of pagan parents near the Persian frontier, somewhere about the year 275, and after his conversion to have become a monk, and subsequently Bishop of Mar Mattaï, to the North of Mosul, where, still extant, are the ruins of his monastery. At his consecration he took the name of James, which caused people for many centuries to attribute his writings to the authorship of James of Nisibis.

From his own statements we know that he wrote his twenty-three homilies between the years 336 and 345. The first twenty-two of these "Demonstrations," as they are called, commence each with one of the Syriac consonants in alphabetical order. Dr. W. Wright discovered and published the original Syriac of the homilies in 1869, which hitherto were only known in an Armenian version.[16] They are very valuable, even though very tiresome documents to read, for in spite of their prolixity and often obscurity, and sometimes unorthodoxy, they give a great deal of information about doctrine and dogma and discipline. For our special purpose they are

[15] Except Egypt. On the Patriarchate of Antioch see R. Janin, *Les Eglises Orientales*, p. 173, *seq. Echos d'Orient*, 1912 and *D.T.C.* Antioche.

[16] Translation of eight of the Demonstrations, vol. xiii, *Nicene and post-Nicene Fathers*, by Dr. Gwynn; *The Homilies of Aphraates the Persian Sage*, edited by W. Wright, Ph.D., D.D., 1869. See also Labourt, *Le Christianisme dans l'Empire Perse*, pp. 32–42, and *Dublin Review* (1906), Art., "Christian Doctrine in an Early Eastern Church."

particularly useful in that they give the Syriac testimony to the foundation of the Church on S. Peter.

A catena of passages dealing with Peter in the writings of Eastern Fathers is apt to be tedious, yet in this case it is of profit. For convenience' sake I have placed these illustrations here, though really they belong to the period just after the close of our First Part. But I think it not unreasonable to judge that the interpretations these Easterns gave in 336 they gave in 325. Aphraates gives the following references to S. Peter :

1. And also Simon, who was called Cephas, because of his faith was called the firm rock, I, 17, p. 351.

2. David . . . . the chief of the kings of Israel, confessed his iniquity and was forgiven ; Simon, too, the *chief of the disciples* . . . . when he repented . . . . our Lord received him and made him the foundation, and called him Cephas, *the edifice of His Church,* VII, 15.[16a]

3. He chose and instructed excellent leaders, and committed the sheep into their hands and gave them authority over all His flock. For He said to Simon Cephas, " Feed My sheep and My lambs and My ewes." So Simon fed His sheep, and he fulfilled his time and handed over the flock to you and departed (x, 4).

4. Jesus the son of Nun set up stones for a testimony in Israel ; and Jesus our Saviour called Simon the firm Stone, and set him up as a faithful witness among the nations (xi, 12). (Parisot.)

5. Moses brought out water from the rock for his people, and Jesus sent Simon Cephas (the rock) to carry His doctrine among the peoples (xxi, 10).

6. David handed over the kingdom to Solomon, and was gathered to his people ; and Jesus handed over *the keys to Simon,* and ascended and returned to Him who sent Him (xxi, 13).

7. Simon Cephas the foundation of the Church . . . . James and John firm pillars of the Church (xxiii).

. . . . .

Turning now to a consideration of the evidence afforded by the eloquent deacon, *S. Ephraem the Syrian,*[17] the more celebrated contemporary of Aphraates, we find in that prolific writer the same recognition of the *person* of Peter as the accepted interpretation of the Petrine promise in Matt. xvi, 18.

In the fourth sermon of Holy Week this occurs :

[16a] Dom. J. Parisot. *Patrologia Syriaca Aphraatis Demonstrationes.*
[17] See de Corswarem, *La Liturgie Byzantine,* p. 116.

Simon, my disciple, I have established you the Foundation of the Church. I have beforehand called you Peter because you will sustain all My building, you are the Inspector of those who build a Church for Me on earth ; if they wish to construct for Me anything unseemly it is for *you the Foundation* to stop them ; you are the *Source* whence flows My doctrine, you are the Chief of My disciples ; in you all the peoples are quenched. Yours is this healthful sweetness that I bestow. Senior of My society, I have chosen you to be the Inheritor of My treasure. *I have given to You the keys of My Kingdom. I have established You over all my treasures.*

As a hymnologist, S. Ephraem the Syrian has a great reputation [17a] and in one of his hymns he sings :

" Blessed art thou, O Simon Kipho, who keepest the keys fashioned by the Holy Ghost. Great and ineffable word is thine which binds and looses in heaven and on earth. O blessed flock entrusted to thy care ! Oh how rapidly hath it grown ! For since thou didst fix the cross over the waters, the sheep enamoured of it brought forth saints and holy virgins of every class. O blessed art thou who didst hold the place of head and tongue in the body of thy brethren, which in very deed, grew up together out of the disciples and the sons of thy Master." (*Hymn* 15. *de S. Johan. Bapt. Editione Romana.*) [18]

Ephraem wrote a commentary on the Diatessaron of Tatian. Speaking of John the Baptist, he says : " When he saw that the course of his life was finished, he handed over his flock to the Chief of Pastors, even as *the Lord* at the time of His death *handed over His flock to Peter, the presbyter of pastors,* in order to show the pastoral solicitude which He had for it." [19]

Peter is described as the *Head and Chief of the disciples,* and as *Head of the Church* and commenting on the fact that Christ did not wash Peter's feet first, he thus explains :

" For whereas the Prince of Angels had just laid aside the dignity and honour that were His, how was it possible for

[17a] See Tixeront, *Précis de Patrologie,* p. 288, *seq.*

[18] Benni, *The Tradition of the Syriac Church of Antioch* (London, 1871).

[19] Mösinger's Latin translation, p. 101.

The Commentary on the Diatessaron exists only in an Armenian version, the original Syriac being lost. The work was translated into Latin by J. B. Aucher and published by G. Mösinger. Venice, 1876. Dr. J. H. Hill wrote a Dissertation on the Commentary, Edinburgh, 1896.

the chief of the disciples to stand upon the dignity of his rank? Would he not rather have learned to imitate the Prince of Angels?"[20]

On the words "Thou art the Rock" Ephraem writes:

"That Rock (namely) which He set up that Satan might stumble thereon, Satan, on the other hand, wished to put this Rock in the way of the Lord, that He might stumble upon it, when Peter said 'Far be it from Thee, Lord.' We should not have said that Satan had devised this unless He Who knew all had made it manifest, saying, 'Get thee behind Me, Satan, for thou art a stumbling-block to Me.' But the Lord took this Rock and cast it behind Him that the sectaries of Satan should stumble thereon."[21]

In his homily "on Our Lord"[22] he says:

"And that our Lord might show that he received the keys from former stewards, he said to Simeon, 'To thee will I give the keys of the doors.' But how should He have given them to another had He not received them from another? So then *the keys* which He had received from Simeon the priest, *He gave to another, Simeon the Apostle*, that even though the people had not hearkened to the former Simeon, the people might hearken to the latter Simeon."

This great Syriac Father speaks of Peter as the "Vicar of Christ":

"Then Peter deservedly received the Vicariate (of Christ) over His people" (*in Sermone de Martyrio. SS. App. Petri et Pauli*).

And commenting on the Transfiguration he speaks of Peter as "the second Moses."

"There were both the prince of the Old and the prince of the New Testament confronting one another. There the saintly Moses beheld the sanctified Simon the steward of the Father, the procurator of the Son. He who forced the sea asunder to let the people walk across the parted waves, beheld him who raised the new tabernacle and built the Church."

In the same sermon he speaks of him as the "Key-bearer."

"If we remain here, how will those things I told thee come to pass? How will the Church be built up? How

[20] *ibid.*, p. 205. [21] *ibid.*, p. 154.
[22] *Post-Nicene Fathers*, xiii, p. 329.

shalt thou receive the keys of the kingdom of heaven? Whom wilt thou bind? Whom wilt thou loose?"[22a]

And once again:

"Hail! Peter, tongue of the disciples, voice of the preachers, eye of the apostles, guardian of heaven, first-born of those who bear the keys!" (*Encom. S.S. Petri et Pauli*).[23]

These are very arresting comments on "Petrine" passages to come from the pen of the chief writer, the most illustrious doctor, of a church Semitic in character held to be so markedly conservative and independent.

But what is still more to be noted, as we shall see later (see below p. 172) is this: that when these churches succumb after the Council of Ephesus to the ravages of Nestorianism, and go into schism, they still retain the traditional interpretations of the pre-eminence of Peter and the belief in the primacy of Peter and of Peter's See.

. . . . .

There seems little doubt that Christianity was brought to *Armenia* from Edessa in the second or third century.[24] Tournebize[25] says the Church of Armenia was already founded in the second century. Gregory the Illuminator is always looked upon as its founder but there certainly were bishops in Armenia before his time. It is a pious tradition among Armenians that S. Thaddaeus brought them the Faith. Tournebize discusses fully the question, and says that an apostolic foundation is possible but not historically proved.[26]

The Armenians have adopted the picturesque legend of Abgar of Edessa, of course without any grounds, and Abgar is transformed into a king of Armenia.[27]

Gregory was a scion of a noble family which had fled to Cæsarea in Cappadocia, and there he received consecration at

[22a] *Sermo de Transfig. Dom. Sec. IV. Edit. Rom. Syro-Græcolatina Vol. II.*

[23] Similar comments are made by S. James of Serug (452–521). All these will be found in Abp. Cyril Benni, *The Tradition of the Syriac Church of Antioch* (London, 1871).

[24] Duchesne, *Churches Separated*, p. 18, doubts this, and puts the origins of the Church of Armenia apparently in the time of Constantine. I cannot understand why.

A writer, George Bartas, in the *Echos d'Orient*, 1911, p. 178, Art. "A Travers l'Orient Chrétien," on the other hand, mentions the claims of Armenian reviews. "*D'abord dit l'un d'eux le christianisme a été prêché en Arménie, non pas au IVe siècle, mais au* 1er *siècle, vers l'an* 35 *après Jesus Christ; par conséquent l'Église Arménienne est* apostolique *et a des droits à l'autocéphalie. De même, elle s'est conservée elle même autocéphale pendant trois siècles sans recevoir de pouvoirs de Césarée.*"

[25] *Histoire Politique et Religieuse de l'Arménie.*

[26] *ibid.*, p. 102. [27] *ibid.*, p. 17.

the hands of Leontius, Bishop of Caesarea, *c.* 302, and thence he returned to his own country to reconstruct the Church. If Christianity had not entirely disappeared, at least it had been greatly effaced.

Armenia, the country which gives its name to the scattered Armenians of to-day, lies at the South of the Black Sea, West of the Caspian. Its religious history during the period we have in review depended to a great extent on its geographical position and its political circumstances. For it was the unfortunate cock-pit of the continual struggles between Romans and Persians, and it was governed by kings subject sometimes to one, sometimes to the other of these Powers.

It was in the time of Tiridates that Armenia became Christian. He had returned from Roman territory whither he had fled, had driven out the Persians and made his country practically independent. From Paganism he was converted by Gregory, and thus Armenia became the first country officially to embrace Christianity. But the see-saw still went on, till at length Theodosius divided the country rather unwisely between himself and Persia. Persia had the lion's share; for the Romans retained only a small corner in the West.

And then a fresh competitor arose. In 639 the Arabs invaded it and though Constantine IV and Justinian II retook parts of the country, for most of the time the Arabs maintained control.

The struggle now is between Empire and Arabs as before it was between Empire and Persians, and the Armenians, having become heretical by adopting the Monophysite heresy, found it as trying to deal with Catholics as with Mohammedans. In 856 an Armenian prince Ashot I started a line of kings subject to the Khalif, and this continued till 1071.[28]

Armenia then was Catholic, with its own adaptation of rites, ceremonies, and rituals, but it was a missionary church, dependent on Cæsarea in Cappadocia, which, in turn, was in communion with Rome.

The idea that it was always an autocephalous church is unhistorical. Till the Council of Ephesus (431) allowed the Church of Cyprus to be autocephalous or autonomous, such a thing was unheard-of.

The fact that the primates of Armenia went up to Cæsarea to be consecrated, just as those of Persia depended on the Church of Edessa for consecration, and just as those of Abyssinia even to-day have recourse to the Coptic Patriarch of

[28] Tournebize, *Op. cit.* 104–134.

Alexandria, shows its dependence. The protest of S. Basil against their schism from Caesarea would be pointless if it were true that the Armenian Church had always been autocephalous. Though he sent his letter of remonstrance to all the Western bishops, it was especially to Pope Damasus that his words were addressed.

> "We have great need of your help, so that those who profess the Apostolic Faith, having destroyed the schisms newly formed, may submit then to the authority of the Church. . . . It is worthy indeed of your exalted Blessedness, this privilege which has been accorded by the Lord to your piety, of disentangling from that which is corrupted that which is accurate and unalloyed, and to preach the Faith of the Fathers without hesitation and without fear."[29]

It was only after the break with Caesarea that the Catholicos of Armenia was consecrated by his own suffragans; and this mode of consecration is the mark of an autocephalous church.

In this first period then, there are some slight indications of the relations of the Armenian Church to Rome.

Tiridates II, at the beginning of his reign, was a Pagan, and he persecuted the Christians. There are two famous martyrs—S. Gaiane and S. Hripsime, and they had been, it seems, the one a religious, the other her abbess in a convent dedicated to S. Paul in Rome.[30]

Another indication is the alleged pact between Gregory the Illuminator and Pope Sylvester I. There seems ground for believing that there was a treaty of some sort between Constantine and Tiridates, so that it is not altogether improbable that something similar may have existed between Gregory and Sylvester, though the letter purporting to set forth their agreement is plainly apocryphal.[31]

Gregory consecrated his own son Aristaces to succeed him, and retired for his closing years to a hermitage. This Aristaces was present at the Council of Nicæa.[32] Tournebize suggests that the Pope would have been informed by his legates of the events in Armenia and would have confirmed in his charge and his privileges the Catholicos Gregory. He maintains that the person who would contest this conclusion would doubt equally the pact between Constantine and the King of Armenia. As a matter of fact, the greater part of the ancient Armenian

[29] *Ep.* xcii. *P. G.*, xxxii.
[30] See Tournebize, *Op. cit.* p. 51.
[31] *ibid.*, p. 55.
[32] *Mansi*, ii, 699.

writers make no separation between the negotiations of Sylvester and Gregory, and those of Constantine and Tiridates.

A patriarch of the Armenians of to-day, Mgr. Ormanian, does not contest this confirmation of the first Armenian Catholicos by Pope Sylvester. But he maintains that it was simply the verifying of a consecration already valid by itself. His point is that the Armenian Church has always been autonomous. I have already shown that that claim is idle.[33]

But something will be seen of the testimony of Armenian writers to the "Petrine" passages when we come to consider the passing of the Armenian Church into Monophysitism.

. . . . .

I think it neither irrelevant nor a digression, before concluding this survey of the evidence of the first three centuries, to take notice of certain archæological research still going on, which both provides confirmation of the tradition of S. Peter at Rome, and also goes to support the contention that this presence of the Apostle was the chief factor in the pre-eminence and primacy of the Roman Church.

To-day the Easterns sing in their office for the protocoryphæi Apostles Peter and Paul (June 29th):

Μακαρίζω σε, Ῥώμη, καὶ εὐφημῶ
Προσκυνῶ καὶ δοξάζω καὶ ἀνυμνῶ.
ἐν σοὶ γὰρ ἀπόκεινται
Τῶν κορυφαίων τὰ σώματα. κ.τ.λ.

(See Pitra *op. cit.* and Nilles *op. cit.*)

Professor Sayce lately affirmed: "Archæologically it is certain that the bodies of SS. Paul and Peter are actually lying at present under the high altar of S. Peter's."[34]

He bases his conclusions on the results which have been yielded by the recent excavations beneath the ancient church of Saint Sebastian.

His lecture follows pretty much the same lines as the very interesting brochure of the Abbé Chéramy, *Saint Sébastien hors les Murs*,[35] in which the learned archæologist has related and discussed the results of these investigations so far obtained.

The spot near which the Church stands was originally a

33 See the notes at foot of p. 171 and above.

34 In an address to the Scottish Ecclesiological Society reported in *The Scotsman* of Monday, Oct. 27, 1925. He makes, however, a slight slip. The body of S. Paul rests under the Church of S. Paul-outside-the-Walls, I think.

35 Paris, 1925.

cemetery, Pagan down to the year 238, and then gradually used for Christian burial.[36] In classical times the place was known as *Ad Catacumbas* because of the conformation of the ground (κατὰ κόμβας), and this name *Catacombs* belonged exclusively to this particular spot, until, in the eighteenth century, it was extended to all the early Christian burial places in Rome.[37]

The Church of S. Sebastian is built above the basilica which Pope Damasus in the fourth century erected in honour of the Apostles Peter and Paul, and was known as " the Church of the Apostles *ad Catacumbas*."

Ancient guide books recorded the tradition that the bodies of Peter and Paul had rested where now was the Church of S. Sebastian, and the primary object of the present excavations was to find the actual spots where the bodies of the apostles had lain.[38] Among the objects which have been discovered is a part of the actual tablet inscribed with the verses composed by Pope Damasus (†384). The words of this epitaph were already known traditionally, having been copied by pilgrims and recorded in various writings.

They are as follows :

Hic habitasse prius sanctos cognoscere debes,
Nomina quisque Petri pariter Paulique requiris,
Discipulos Oriens misit, quod sponte fatemur ;
Sanguinis ob meritum—Christumque per astra secuti
Aetherios petiere sinus regnaque piorum
Roma suos potius meruit defendere cives.
Haec Damasus vestras referat nova sidera laudes.

Of these verses it may be said they are not altogether clear nor their meaning quite certain.

Hic habitasse might mean the place where Peter and Paul had lived, though, without doubt, the poet means the place where the bodies of the martyrs were laid to rest.[39]

Discipulos Oriens misit, quod sponte fatemur. For what purpose would the East have sent disciples ? Would it be to take back the bodies of the martyr apostles ?[40]

[36] cf. Chéramy, *Op. cit.* p. 72.

[37] *Catacumba* was, however, sometimes, though extremely rarely, used as a generic term to describe similar passages, e.g. a cemetery in Naples in the tenth century.

[38] Chéramy, *Op. cit.* p. 66, " *bien que l'on n'ait pas pu préciser l'emplacement. (M. Marucchi a cru le trouver, mais malgré son autorité, il n'a pas pu faire accepter son sentiment.)*"

[39] See Batiffol's Introduction, p. 10, to Chéramy's book and p. 53 *seq.* of the book itself.

[40] See p. 62 *Op. cit.* and cf. the letter of Gregory the Great when Constantia, wife of the Emperor Maurice, wrote to him to ask relics of the two

Eusebius (*H.E.* ii, 25) quotes the Presbyter Caius as saying, "If you will go to the Vatican or to the Ostian way, you will find the trophies of those who laid the foundations of the Church." In those places without doubt rested the bodies of Peter and Paul until apparently they were removed in the year 258 "ad Catacumbas" for safety during the time of the Valerian persecution. There is, as could have been anticipated from what has been said already, a good deal of controversy about this translation, but this is the generally accepted view; and the tradition says the bodies were secreted at the bottom of a well.

As recently as April 1925 fragments of a sarcophagus of the third century came to light depicting the beheading of S. Paul—the most ancient known sculpture of the martyrdom. At the same time there was found a fragment of another sarcophagus representing S. Peter and the miraculous draught of fishes. "*On remarquera que ces dernières découvertes rappellent une fois de plus le souvenir des apôtres saint Pierre et saint Paul à Saint-Sébastien hors les Murs.*"[41]

But still more important are the *graffiti*—more than a hundred of them—which have been uncovered. These undoubtedly date from the latter half of the third century and they show that it was a place of popular pilgrimage and of a special *cultus* in honour of the two great founders of the Roman Church.[42]

Some are scribbled in Greek, some are Latin in Greek characters, though most are in Latin.

These will serve as examples:

Peter and Paul remember Antonius Bassus.
Peter and Paul intercede for Leontius.

Apostles Peter and Paul. He relates the story to which Damasus in his Inscription apparently makes allusion, of the efforts of the Eastern Christians to take back to their country the bodies of their martyred countrymen.

"It is well known," writes Gregory, "that at the time when they suffered, Christians from the East came to recover their bodies as of their fellow-citizens, and having carried them as far as the second milestone from the city, laid them in the place which is called *ad Catacumbas;* but when the whole company of them assembled together and attempted to take them from thence, a storm of thunder and lightning so greatly terrified them, and dispersed them, that after that they durst not make any more attempts. The Romans, however, then went out and took up their bodies, having been counted worthy to do this by the goodness of the Lord, and laid them in the places where they are now buried." *Op. S. Greg., t.* ii, Ep. 30.

[41] Chéramy, *Op. cit.* p. 82, note 1.

[42] *ibid.*, pp. 58–61. Chéramy writes, p. 66, *La date est discutée; la plus vraisemblable semble celle de* 258 *sous les consuls Tuscus et Bassus pendant la persécution de Valérien.*

Sometimes the name of Paul comes first, e.g.

Paul and Peter intercede for Victor.

In honour of Peter and Paul, I Tomius
Caelius have made the *refrigerium.*

This last word demands a comment. Without doubt it is an allusion to a custom followed at this place, analagous to the primitive " Agape " or love-feast of the Early Christians. The excavations have revealed the remains of a long, low, covered cloister or " triclia "[43] where, in imitation of that old custom, now discontinued, of the early Christians, the faithful were evidently wont to gather to observe similar rites in memory of their dear ones close to where their bodies lay.

. . . . .

Bishop Gore finds it pertinent to point out that the Church of Rome was a " Greek " Church, at any rate up to " an unknown moment before the middle of the third century." He speaks of " the Church of Rome, which up to that time had been Greek in language—alike in her liturgy and her theology—a Greek colony in the Latin city."[44]

And thus he so far agrees with Batiffol : *Cette papauté des premiers âges était bien plus grecque que latine, car Rome était alors bien plus grecque que latine.*[45]

It would be profitable if historical writers more frequently drew attention to the significance of the fact that numerous sons of the East sat on the papal throne. Something more will be said of this point later. Meanwhile I would remark that apart from S. Peter, nine of the popes of this first period are " Easterns " :

Pope.	*Date.*	*Nationality.*
Evaristus	100	Greek
Telesphorus	127	Greek
Hyginus	139	Athenian
Anicetus	157	Syrian of Emesa
Eleutherius	177	Greek of Nicopolis

[43] Chéramy, *Op. cit.* p. 79, gives a picture of the *reconstitution* of this *triclia.*

For other archæological evidence see the quotation from Lanciani in Appendix IV, also the extract from Bishop Chase's Article in *Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible,* iii, 777. cf. Dr. G. Edmundson's *Bampton Lectures,* 1913, " The Church of Rome in the First Century." Prof. Liegtmann of Jena, *Petrus und Paulus in Rom, liturgische und archäologische Studien* (Bonn, 1915). Kirsopp Lake, *Encyclopædia Britannica,* xxi, 287 (11th ed.).

For Harnack's reasons for the Roman primacy see Appendix VI.

[44] *Roman Catholic Claims,* p. 97.

[45] *The Christian East,* Dec., 1925, vol. v, No. 4, p. 184, Art., "Mgr. P. Batiffol's Rejoinder."

Anterus	235	Greek
Sixtus II	257	Greek (Athenian)
Caius	288	Dalmatian
Eusebius	310	Greek of Calabria

Victor (193) and Melchiades[46] (311) are Africans.

The witnesses who have been adduced as to the position of Rome in these first three centuries, are all members of Eastern Churches. Not one of them attributes the authority of the Bishop of Rome to the fact that Rome is the capital of the Empire. Such a basis could not bear the super-structure. They speak of the Apostles Peter and Paul ; of their martyrdom at Rome. Not one of them speaks of the presence of an emperor. The rights which the Bishops of Rome claim and exercise are no grants of an emperor. That fantastic assertion which is sometimes made is seen to be manifestly baseless.

But the history of the Roman primacy in the first three centuries cannot well be put more concisely than in the summary which Mgr. Duchesne has made :

" Thus all the Churches throughout the known world, from Arabia, Osrhoene, and Cappadocia to the extreme West, felt incessant influence of Rome in every respect, whether as to faith, discipline, administration, ritual, or works of charity. She was, as S. Irenæus says, ' known everywhere and respected everywhere, and her guidance was universally accepted.' No competitor, no rival stands up against her ; no one conceives the idea of being her equal. Later on there will be patriarchs and other local primates, whose first beginnings can be but vaguely perceived during the course of the third century. Above these rising organisations, and above the whole body of isolated Churches, the Church of Rome rises in supreme majesty, the Church of Rome represented by the long series of her bishops, which ascends to the two chiefs of the Apostolic College; she knows herself to be, and is considered by all, the centre and the organ of unity."[47]

[46] " *dessen Primat damals schon in der ganzen Christenheit anerkannt war.*" (*Seeck*, iii, 324.)

[47] Duchesne, *Churches Separated*, pp. 103–4.

CHAPTER IV

THE COUNCIL OF NICÆA, 325

BEFORE examining the documents relative to the first General Council, with the object of establishing whether they support the Primacy of the Roman Bishop, it is advantageous briefly to exhibit the various theories of the conditions to be fulfilled, if a Council is to be reckoned Œcumenical.

And the special question to be answered is this: What in the judgment of the Easterns constituted a General Council?

The Eastern Church to-day constantly calls herself "the Church of the Seven Œcumenical Councils."[1] In the contentious *Encyclical of the Patriarch Anthimus* (1895) we find he uses the expression at the beginning of seven successive paragraphs.

These Councils are to her infallible. And of course in this infallibility of General Councils the Roman Church agrees. But it cannot be said that there is anything in Scripture about General Councils.

There is no command to hold them.[2]

[1] Duchesne not unfairly, if somewhat sarcastically, says of the Easterns, "Let us speak of this formula (*sc. The Church of the Seven Œcumenical Synods*). They reproach us with having added one word to the Creed; but I maintain that here they add a fifth characteristic mark to the four by which the Symbol defines the true Church. The Church is not only one, holy, catholic and apostolic; she is also the Church of the Seven Œcumenical Synods. Wherefore do they add this qualification? Is there anywhere in the Gospels, or in the Apocalypse, a prescription in virtue of which the future Church might, or was to, qualify herself thus? Did the seventh Œcumenical Council shut the door after itself, prohibit all other similar assemblies, prescribe that all should abide only by it and be called after it? I think that 'no' is the answer to these questions." *Churches Separated*, p. 45.

[2] But cf. Jeremy Taylor, *Works*, v, p. 442. "The Spirit of God hath directed us by that great precedent at Jerusalem to address ourselves to the Church, that in a plenary council she may synodically determine controversies. So that if a general council have determined a question or expounded Scripture, we may no more disbelieve the decree than the Spirit of God who speaks in them."

Easterns would agree with these recent words of Bishop Gore (though, I imagine, they would put it more strongly): "There are certain occasions—the Œcumenical Councils—when the Church has squarely faced a question definitely raised, and has definitely answered it after full consideration, and in a representative assembly, and the answer has been accepted so widely and continuously that you may truly say, This is the voice of the Catholic Church; this you can rely upon with the same con-

The first General Council is held not until the world has seen three centuries of Christianity. Whether they are or are not part of the apostolic constitution of the Church is a disputed question even among Roman Catholics. Hefele derives the origin of councils from the Council of Jerusalem (Acts xv).[3] "They are an *apostolical* institution," he writes, "but the apostles, when they instituted them, acted under the commission which they received from Christ, otherwise they could not have published the decision of their synod with the words 'It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us.' They must have been convinced that the Lord of the Church had promised and had granted His Spirit to the assemblies of the Church."[4]

While Mgr. Batiffol, replying to a paragraph dealing with the position of Œcumenical Councils in an article by Professor Glubokovsky "Papal Rome and Orthodox East"[5] writes:

> *"M. Glubokovsky semble croire que les conciles œcuméniques appartiennent à la constitution divine de l'Eglise ; ils n'appartiennent qu'au* Kirchenrecht ! *Ils ne sont pas, en effet, une institution du Christ ou des apôtres. Leur* magisterium *est le* magisterium *collectif de l'épiscopat universel en y comprenant l'évêque de Rome, et l'assistance du Saint Esprit qu'ils revendiquent est celle qui est promise à cet épiscopat universel.*[6] *Les conciles œcuméniques ne sont jamais absolument nécessaires."*[7]

fidence which inspired the first Church of Jerusalem to say 'It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us.' And in spite of the disagreeable moral impression which some of the General Councils leave upon our minds, I believe the claim to be justified" (*The Holy Spirit and the Church*, p. 205).

[3] It may be observed that a Roman Catholic scholar, Dr. A. Ryan, thus speaks of the Council of Jerusalem (*Tablet*, Nov. 12, 1927, Art., "The Government of the Church"): "*The history of the first Œcumenical Council, the Council of Jerusalem*, shows," etc.

[4] Hefele, *History of the Councils*, p. 1. cf. also p. 52.

[5] *The Christian East*, Nov. 1923.

[6] *Christian East*, Feb., 1924. Art., "Papal Rome and Orthodox East." The next words of Mgr. Batiffol's article may usefully be inserted here, as they have a bearing on the point which will come up shortly for consideration. "*Mais, poursuit M. Glubokovsky supposé le pape infaillible, le concile œcuménique sans le pape n'a pas* the decisive voice in Church affairs. *Nous l'accordons sans difficulté.*"

[7] *Donc, conclut M. Glubokovsky,* "Councils, fully such as the Œcumenical Councils, have no room at all in the present system of the Papacy." "*M. Glubokovsky ne conçoit le concile que souverain, nous le concevons coordonné ; coordonné à l'autorité du pape en l'absence duquel il ne s'assemble pas.*" The cause of all the discussion between Prof. Glubokovsky and Mgr. Batiffol was the article of the latter in the *Revue des jeunes* (April 10, 1923), entitled "Bishop Gore et Nous" and republished in English in *Blackfriars*, June, 1923, under the title "Anglo-Catholics and Roman Catholics," and containing this passage: "Dr. Gore is quite right in holding that the Roman Church is not the whole Catholic Church. For it is a point of elementary theology that, on the supposition of the principle of

Scripture shows that the "guidance into all truth" is promised to the Church. It is only derivatively with General Councils. It is difficult to maintain that they are of absolute necessity,[8] since, as has been said, Christianity had been on its course for three hundred years before one was held; and in the period we are investigating there were seven in eight hundred years. And I have never been able to find any explanation on the part of Easterns why they have apparently believed themselves unable or incompetent to hold one since the break with Rome in 1054. Anyhow, the fact remains that they have never held one since.[9]

It is only fair to give the words of another recent Roman Catholic writer on the point. "Normally guidance comes from the living voice of the Church, as manifested in the teaching of her bishops scattered the world over. The fact of their being collocated does not give them any access of authority. The

the inerrancy of the Church, the subject of this infallibility is not only the pope, but includes as well the bishops, whether scattered throughout the world or united in œcumenical council. For us Roman Catholics the prerogative peculiar to the Bishops of Rome does not do away with the prerogative of œcumenical councils" (p. 873). cf. Hefele, vol. i, p. 51. With this should be read Prof. Glubokovsky's criticism in *The Christian East* for November, 1923, pp. 185–6 (vol. iv, No. 4). Mgr. Batiffol has since published the Article together with others on similar questions in a small volume *Catholicisme et Papauté, Les difficultés anglicaines et russes* (Paris, 1925, Lecoffre).

[8] Even Dr. Gore says: "A general council is not a necessity," *Roman Catholic Claims*, p. 55.

cf. Soloviev, "*Si l'organisation normale de l'Eglise universelle et la vraie forme de son gouvernement tiennent aux conciles œcuméniques, il est évident que l'Orient Orthodoxe, fatalement privé de cet organe indispensable de la vie ecclésiastique, n'a plus la vraie constitution ni le gouvernement régulier de l'Eglise. Durant les trois premiers siècles du christianisme, l'Eglise cimentée par le sang des martyrs ne convoquait pas de conciles universels parce qu'elle n'en avait pas besoin; l'Eglise orientale actuelle, paralysée et démembrée,* ne peut pas *le faire tout en en éprouvant le besoin. Cela nous met dans l'alternative suivante: ou bien avouer, avec les sectaires avancés, que l'Eglise a perdu depuis un certain temps son caractère divin et n'existe plus réellement sur la terre, ou bien, pour éviter une conclusion si dangereuse, reconnaître que l'Eglise Universelle, n'ayant pas d'organes gouvernementaux et représentatifs en Orient, les possède dans sa partie occidentale. Cela reviendrait à reconnaître une vérité historique avouée de nos jours par les protestants eux-mêmes, à savoir: que la papauté actuelle n'est pas une usurpation arbitraire, mais un développement légitime des principes qui étaient en activité manifeste avant la division de l'Eglise et contre lesquels certes l'Eglise n'a jamais protesté.* p. 22. *Op. cit.*

[9] In fact, one of their publications, *Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques*, 1924, n. 5–6, p. 9, has this curious paragraph: "*Pour l'Eglise occidentale, il n'est pas nouveau d'assembler des conciles, qu'elle appelle œcuméniques. Elle en compte douze* (*sic*), *mais la véritable Eglise œcuménique, par une spéciale Providence de Dieu, n'a plus vu de concile depuis plus de mille ans,*" quoted by M. d'Herbigny, *Orientalia Christiana*, vol. iii, n. 11, p. 99, Art., "L'Ame religieuse des Russes."

Church may avail herself of the collective knowledge of her bishops met in council the better to counteract the errors incidental to every succeeding age, but her infallibility is not as it were in abeyance until she does so. Councils fulfil a useful function in making clear the bearing of divine revelation on problems of the day ; they are part of the natural economy of which the Church avails herself in her office of divine teacher."[10]

. . . . .

What makes a Council " General " ?

It cannot be the numbers of members, for some councils which have had more members have not been accounted General ; and though of course in theory all the bishops of the world (*οἰκουμένη*) are summoned, not one of them, as a matter of fact, was (from various reasons) ever attended by all the bishops of the world.

And these Seven Councils, " all held in the East by bishops of the East, under the influence of the emperors of the East,"[11] had very few Western members—only four bishops from the West, for example, were at Nicæa, none at Constantinople I, only two at Ephesus.

If it is said that it is its subsequent acceptance by the Church which makes it " General," i.e. what is usually called the " Gallican " theory—the theory which, I take it, is held by Easterns to-day[12]—it is to be pointed out that the Councils themselves have not been absolutely unanimous. After Nicæa there were eighty bishops who disagreed. After Ephesus thirty sided with Nestorius. The Council of Chalcedon was followed by the great separation of the Eutychians and Monophysites. There is also this real difficulty in the objection that would be urged—that the Faithful would want to know first of all whether the Council *was* œcumenical before they acknowledged their duty to accept it.

It appears that what *in the opinion of the Easterns of these centuries made a Council to be reckoned œcumenical* was *ratification and confirmation by the Pope.*[13] And bearing in mind the

[10] *The Papacy*, p. 183, Art., " The Vatican Council and Papal Infallibility," by Rev. R. Downey, D.D.

cf. Bp. Gore, p. 55, *Op. cit.* where he quotes Mr. Wilberforce, *Principles of Church Authority*, p. 77, " The judgment of the Church *diffusive* is no less binding than that of the Church *collective.*"

[11] Guizot, *Civilisation en France*, 12e leçon.

[12] cf. e.g. Prof. Glubokovsky in *The Christian East, loc. cit.*, and A. H. Hore, *Eighteen Centuries of the Orthodox Greek Church*, p. 176 (1899). cf. Art., " Conciles," in *D. T. C., t.* iii, col. 636 *seq.*, by J. Forget.

[13] The Acts of the Council of Nicæa have not survived, so this cannot be asserted of Nicæa. But then every one knew that the Pope agreed with

words of the Greek Bishop of Lyons that it is necessary for all Churches "*convenire*" (whatever *convenire* may mean) with the Roman Church, because of its *potentiorem principalitatem* (however much or little that may mean), the contention is hard to dispute. With the history that lies before us it seems to me impossible to do so.[14]

. . . . .

Arianism had come to trouble the Church in place of persecution. Constantine had given external peace to the Church, but in Alexandria the Libyan priest Arius arose to proclaim to the world a heresy which, though named after him, and supremely owing to him, was not entirely novel[15]—to propagate false but attractive teaching, which was destined to distract, even more than persecution, the Church for many weary years.

Alexander the Bishop of Alexandria had spoken one day in the presence of his priests and clergy on the doctrine of the Trinity. Arius professed to find Sabellianism in this "Conversation," and vehemently asserted of the Son ἦν ποτε, ὅτε οὐκ ἦν and ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων ἔχει τήν ὑπόστασιν.[16]

Of course the charges against his bishop were baseless, and Alexander took steps to vindicate the Catholic faith.

The Patriarch of Alexandria, in a synod (320 or 321) of his hundred suffragans, condemned and excommunicated Arius

the Council, and is not the signature of the papal legates—never withdrawn or repudiated—equivalent to the confirmation by the Roman see?

The Council of Rome, 485 (Mansi, vii, 1140), says that "the 318 bishops assembled at Nicæa referred the confirmation and authority of matters to the holy Roman Church."

[14] This point, of course, will be dealt with more fully as we proceed with the details of the history of the various Councils. Dr. B. J. Kidd writes in *The Christian East*, June, 1925 (Art., "The Council of Nicæa"): "There are, in the largest reckoning, twenty Councils, from the Nicene to the Vatican, claiming to be œcumenical. Of these, the first eight were summoned by the emperors. They were councils of the Οἰκουμένη or Roman empire, and œcumenical in that sense. But for œcumenicity in the wider sense there must be representation of the episcopate as a whole, including effective co-operation on the part of the pope, as Head of the Episcopal College. The pope did not convoke any of the first eight councils, nor can it be shown that, by an act of subsequent confirmation, he gave to all of them œcumenical authority. But in respect of those that were œcumenical in their celebration, he did effectively co-operate."

But cf. the words of S. Stephen Junior of the Iconoclast Council of Hieria: "How can you call œcumenical a council when the Bishop of Rome has not given his consent and when the canons forbid ecclesiastical affairs to be decided without the Pope of Rome?"

cf. also the words of S. Theodore of Studium cited below p. 302.

[15] cf. Newman, *Arians*, pp. 6–7. Hefele, *Councils*, i, p. 237 *seq.* Tixeront, *Histoire des Dogmes*, ii, 21. Hefele himself has written a dissertation on the origin of Arianism in *Tübing. Theol. Quartalschrift*, 1851.

[16] Socrates, *H. E.*, i, 5.

and his followers. And with Alexander there was as secretary the Greek Athanasius, a native of the Greek colony at Alexandria, then only a deacon, but one day to become the protagonist in the long-drawn struggle.

But the trouble still went on, and a new sort of Council was proposed—one of the empire. Perhaps Alexander suggested it and commended the idea to Hosius and thus to Constantine.[17]

As Batiffol remarks: "*L'idée, si neuve qu'elle pût paraître, ne faisait que donner corps à cette consultation de l'épiscopat universel à laquelle* l'Eglise romaine *avait eu maintes fois recours. L'unité de l'Empire restaurée par Constantin se prêtait providentiellement à un concile général, qui ne serait plus une 'assemblée du clergé,' comme l'avait été le concile d'Arles de* 314, *mais vraiment la* repraesentatio *des évêques de toutes les Eglises qui étaient sous le ciel.*"[18]

Constantine was solicitous for tranquillity throughout his empire. That was his great motive in summoning the Council. At first he had thought the contention was all rather a matter of words which could easily be reconciled.[19] He soon saw that it was a much more serious affair. He took every measure to convoke a great assembly of bishops to deal with the evil, and he made the meeting of the Council the easier by providing the imperial post-carriages for the conveyance of the Fathers and by granting their expenses. The emperor himself was present at any rate at first.[20] He made an opening speech which certainly, as Eusebius gives it, was felicitous and well-turned in phrase. He spoke in Latin, which was at once translated by an interpreter into Greek for the benefit of the bishops, who, for the most part, knew only Greek; but since Constantine could speak Greek without difficulty[21] it seems that Latin was considered the official language of the emperor and State.

No time could have been more suitable, more providential for the Council than now. The empire was one, and the emperor was bent on keeping it, in every way, one. The

[17] *Sulpit. Sever.* (*Hist.* ii, 55) *Nicaena Synodus, auctore illo* (*Hosio*) *confecta habebatur.*

[18] *La Paix Constantinienne*, p. 319.

[19] Eusebius, *Vit. Const.*, ii, 69, It appears to him "that they are questions respecting things of no importance and of no use, which Alexander ought not to have excited, and about which Arius ought to have kept his different views to himself." The controversies, the emperor says, are sharper than those of the Donatists.

[20] Eusebius, *Vit. Const.* iii, 12.

[21] See e.g. Eusebius, *Vit. Const.* iii, 13.

Council of Nicæa is the climax of the chapter opened by the Edict of Milan.

It is unfortunate, for many reasons, that the Acts of the Council of Nicæa are not extant. Some have questioned whether any Acts ever existed.[22] Baronius believed that they had,[23] and the latest writer on the subject, A. Wikenhauser, concludes *a priori* that there was most likely a shorthand account of the proceedings, and there is no positive proof to the contrary.[24]

Yet, even with the scanty material that we have, the information is quite sufficient to indicate what the relations of the Eastern Churches to Rome were at that time.

The Greek historians, Socrates and Sozomen, write a century after the Council, but there is extant a certain amount of contemporary evidence. Athanasius, the great figure in the Council, has left such information that we could wish he had given more.[25] Eustathius, Bishop of Antioch, left some memoranda which Theodoret in the next century incorporated in his History.[26]

Eusebius of Cæsarea in his " Letter to the people of Cæsarea " gives the Creed of Cæsarea.

These are not very much, it is true, but they are the testimonies of three participants in the synod. And besides these we have also contemporary evidence in the Creed, the canons of the Council and the Synodal Decree.

We may reverse the chronological order of the data and examine the evidence supplied by the canons issued at the end of the Council.

Two canons of the Council of Nicæa have a bearing on our subject—the sixth and the seventh.

> " The old customs in use in Egypt, in Libya, and in Pentapolis shall continue to exist, that is that the Bishop of Alexandria shall have jurisdiction over all these (provinces), for there is a similar relation for the Bishop of Rome. The rights which they formerly possessed must also be preserved to the Churches of Antioch and in the other eparchies (provinces)."[27]

[22] Hefele-Leclercq, *Conciles*, i, 386 *seq.* and Hefele [*E. T.*], p. 262 *seq.*

[23] *Annales*, 325.

[24] *Zur Frage nach der Existenz von nizaenischen Synodal-protokollen* in the collection of F. Doelger *Konstantin der Grosse und seine Zeit* (1913), p. 122 *seq.*

[25] *De Decretis Nic. Syn.*

[26] *H. E.* i, viii.

[27] Hefele, Hist. of Ch. Councils, i, p. 389.

Hefele does not doubt that this Canon VI is concerned with what was afterwards called the patriarchate of the Bishop of Alexandria.[28] Dr. B. J. Kidd writes: "It is sometimes contended that only the patriarchal rights of the Roman bishop were thus under consideration, and that his papal authority remains in the background,"[29] but he makes plain his disagreement with the contention. However, I think Hefele is right. It is not the ordinary rights of metropolitans that this canon is concerned with, but the rights of a superior metropolitan, i.e. of a patriarch. The canon also acknowledges for the Bishop of Antioch the rights which it acknowledged for the Bishop of Alexandria, viz. what one calls later patriarchal rights. And the Council points out that these rights of Alexandria and Antioch are analogous to those which the Bishop of Rome enjoys, i.e. his power as patriarch.[30]

The claim of the pope, it must be remembered, was to be

(1) Bishop of Rome.
(2) Metropolitan of the Roman Province.
(3) Primate of Italy.
(4) Patriarch of the West.
(5) Pope, i.e. primate of the Universal Church.

Hefele holds that this canon does not consider the pope as primate of the Universal Church, nor as simply Bishop of Rome, but it has him in view as one of the great metropolitans, with not one province but several under his jurisdiction.[31]

It is outside our immediate purpose to discuss the extent of the jurisdiction alluded to in the canon, a subject which has given rise to a great deal of controversy. Here it is necessary to draw attention to the fact that Zonaras and Balsamon, the Greek commentators of the twelfth century, lay down that this sixth canon confirms the rights of the Bishop of Rome as Patriarch of the whole West.[32]

Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, these are recognised as already the three chief sees, and after the Council of Chalcedon, their bishops are known as patriarchs.

[28] Hefele, Hist. of Ch. Councils, i, p. 391.

[29] "The Council of Nicæa" in *Christian East* of June, 1925. See also *Echos d'Orient*, No. 140, Art. by V. Grumel. "Le siège de Rome et le Concile de Nicée."
Revue Apologétique (July, 1925). Art. by J. Devillard, "La Papauté et le Concile de Nicée."

[30] Hefele, p. 403, quotes Maassen: "They preferred to refer to the fact that the Bishop of Rome already enjoyed the same position."

[31] Vol. i, p. 397.

[32] See Hefele, i, p. 399, and Chapman, Art. cit. p. 91 and footnote.

There is a considerable school of writers which maintains that the Council of Nicæa conferred the primacy on the Bishop of Rome. It seems to me that the Fathers of Nicæa recognised the primacy as already there. The witness of the history of Clement, Ignatius, the Paschal controversy, the question of the re-baptism of heretics, is to the primacy of Rome, in and from the first century. It is quite unnecessary to have the support of the words *Quod Ecclesia Romana semper habuit primatum*—the sentence wherewith the Roman legate Paschasinus introduced the canon at the Council of Chalcedon—though it is not proved that they were an interpolation. The primacy is manifest in the history itself.[33]

Canon VII lays down :

> " As custom and ancient tradition show that the Bishop of Ælia ought to be honoured (in a special manner) he shall have precedence ; without prejudice, however, to the dignity which belongs to the metropolis."[34] (i.e. of Cæsarea in Palestine.)

So he is to have an honorary rank after the " patriarchs "; the Bishop of Cæsarea being guaranteed his rights over the Bishop of Ælia.

But the Bishop of Ælia came to wish to be independent of Cæsarea, and even of Antioch the patriarchate.

Polychronius wrote to Pope Celestine : " Is it not Jerusalem that God Himself has chosen for Christ to be born there ?" (a slight mistake however !) " Is it not there that he suffered and rose again ? Is it not there that He made the Holy Spirit descend on His disciples ? There that the Church of Christ was constituted for the first time ? There that the Apostles Peter, James and John preached the Gospel ? Is it not from her, in short, that the prophets have foretold that the Truth should go out to spread itself over all the world ?"

Juvenal was very ambitious for his see[35] and found an opponent in Cyril of Alexandria, while Leo the Great was against him too. However, Jerusalem at last attained its ambition at the Council of Chalcedon. It became a patriarchate with a very small jurisdiction—Palestine. The Council in Trullo mentions it as the fifth see in the hierarchy of the Church.

But to return. There is a certain amount of difference among

[33] See Hefele, i, p. 401 and the quotation on p. 403 *ibid.* from Maassen.
[34] Hefele, i, p. 404.
[35] For history of patriarchate of Jerusalem see R. Janin *Op. cit.* 181, *seq.* and Soloviev, p. 81.

historians as to the date of the opening of the Council, but May 20 seems to be the likely date. For some time discussions took place between the Catholics, the Arians and the philosophers[36] until Constantine himself came in state to mark the more solemn opening of the Council, some time after the 3rd July.

. . . . . .

The only representatives of the West were the Spanish bishop, Hosius of Cordova, together with the Roman priests, Vitus and Vincentius, and four other bishops: Cecilian of Carthage, Marcus of Calabria, Nicasius of Dijon, and Domnus of Stridon in Pannonia.

The invitation or order, παράγγελμα as Eusebius terms it, to the Council of Nicæa was issued by Constantine himself. Indeed, all the councils with which we are concerned were convened by the emperors. More will be said about this point later when dealing with other councils, but there can be no question that the letters of convocation to this the First Œcumenical Council were sent out by the Emperor Constantine, and that Pope Sylvester, like the rest, received his invitation.[37]

But this is not equivalent to saying that the summons to an œcumenical council did not go forth from the pope—the head of the Church—that there was neither previous approval nor subsequent confirmation by the pope. And of this very Council of Nicæa Rufinus relates that the emperor assembled the synod "according to the judgment (*sententiâ*) of the bishops," which would necessarily include Sylvester predominantly. If he consulted the bishops he must certainly have consulted the chief of them.

The *Liber Pontificalis*[38] says:

> *Factum est concilium cum ejus* (*sc. Sylvestri*) *praeceptu*(*m*) *in Nicæa Bithiniæ.*

Discount as one may the testimony of Gelasius of Cyzicus

[36] Socrates, i, 8. Sozomen, i, 17.

[37] *H. E.* i, 1. *P. L.* xxi, 468. In the λόγος προσφωνητικός which the Sixth General Council addressed to Constantine Pogonatus (Mansi, xi, 657) there is a remarkable passage showing the belief of the Easterns of the seventh century, that Pope and Emperor together convoked the five General Councils:

"*Constantine ever Augustus and the famous Sylvester immediately assembled the great and illustrious Synod of Nicæa.*"

"The great King Theodosius and Damasus resisted him" (*sc.* Macedonius).

"Celestine and Cyril arose against Nestorius."

"The trumpet of Leo, like the mighty roaring of a lion echoing from Rome"—against Eutyches.

"Vigilius agreed with the all-pious Justinian."

[38] Duchesne, i, 171 (Paris, 1886).

(*c.* 475) as not being trustworthy[39] there is the explicit statement of the Third Council of Constantinople (680) that:

"Constantine and Sylvester summoned the great Synod of Nicæa."[40]

The significance of this last lies in this: it was not said in a council of the West or of Rome, but of the East, in Constantinople, by a council predominantly Eastern, and at a time when the feelings of the East towards the West were beginning to be those of a rival.

The question arises why did not Pope Sylvester, if he were in favour of the Council, attend it? Eusebius, like most writers, gives the advanced age of the Pope as the reason, but Sylvester managed to live ten more years after the Council. Constantine is confessedly the idol of Eusebius, and the bishops had come from far and near to do honour to the Emperor; the absence of the first of them had somehow to be explained. "The presence of the Bishop of Rome would have been homage of the greatest value."[41] It has been urged that it was consciousness of his importance and prestige as successor of S. Peter, of his supreme authority in the Church, that prevented his leaving his see. And it has also been suggested that he was not forgetful of the high-handed way in which Constantine had treated the Roman see in the Donatist matter; in fact, he had before declined to attend the Council of Arles, though strongly invited to do so, and the letter of the Council to Sylvester is noteworthy: in it the members say that they would have greatly desired that the Pope had been able to assist in person at the sessions, and that the judgment given against Cecilian's accusers would in that case certainly have been more severe.[42]

And the bishops at Arles imply that it is suitable that the Bishop of Rome should stay in his city, the city of the apostles who rule there always:

recedere a partibus illis minime potuisti, in quibus et Apostoli quoque sedent, et cruor ipsorum sine intermissione Dei gloriam testatur.[43]

Evidently succeeding popes looked on this example of Sylvester as a precedent, and, as we shall see, were generally unwilling to leave the city, at any rate, to take part personally in an Œcumenical Council.

. . . . .

39 *P. G.* lxxxv, 1179.
40 Mansi, ii, 661. *Actio*, 18.
41 *Echos d'Orient.* No. 140. *Art. cit.*
42 Mansi, ii, 469.
43 *P. L.*, viii, 818.

Which of the bishops presided at the Council? Constantine himself, we know, at first "presided," but this was solely a presidency of honour.[44] This is plain from the words of Eusebius, who records that the Emperor, having finished his inaugural speech to the fathers

παρεδίδου τὸν λόγον τοῖς τῆς συνόδου προέδροις.[45]

The question is: Who held the first rank among the assembled prelates to conduct the theological discussions?

There can be little, if any, doubt that Hosius, the Bishop of Cordova, "the most celebrated of the Spaniards,"[46] presided.

As Constantine had sent Hosius to Alexandria, evidently to try to effect some compromise between Alexander and Arius (though indeed without success), it is probable that Hosius owed his position as president (if such was the case) to Constantine's nomination. The Emperor may have suggested him, thinking that a Western bishop would be more likely than an Eastern bishop to give an impartial examination and judgment in this dispute among Easterns. But, even so, it is a *Western* bishop who presides over a Council practically *Eastern*. And he presides although two of the great "patriarchs" were present—Alexander of Alexandria, the second personage in the Christian Church, and Eustathius of Antioch, the third. There must be some significance in the fact that the three Latins—two of them only priests—sign the decrees before these great figures.

It seems, then, not at all unlikely that even if the emperor appointed Hosius, it was at the request of Sylvester of Rome.

The words of Rufinus, that he acted "according to the judgment of the bishops," could include this.[47]

It is true that the Church historians, Eusebius, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, throw little light on the question of the presidency of the Council.[48] They mention the two priests Vitus and Vincentius as legates of the Roman see, but their relation to Hosius is not very apparent.

The testimony of Gelasius of Cyzicus, which is quite unequivocal, is, by itself, accounted of little value, since he is

[44] cf. the letter of Pope Leo to the Council of Chalcedon. βασιλεῖς δὲ πιστοὶ πρὸς εὐκοσμίαν ἐξῆρχον.

[45] *Vit. Const.* iii, 13; and see Hefele i, p. 41.

[46] Socrates, *H. E.* i, 8.

[47] Hefele says: "It is impossible to determine whether the Emperor Constantine acted only in his own name or in concert with the Pope, in assembling the bishops." i, p. 269.

[48] See Hefele, i, p. 37.

confessed on all hands to be often untrustworthy and a manipulator of his materials. But he says :

> " Hosius was the representative of the Bishop of Rome ; and he was present at the Council of Nicæa with the two Roman priests, Vitus and Vincentius."[49]

However, there is other evidence which to my mind leaves no doubt of the presidency of Hosius—a presidency which Photius has not questioned. Athanasius himself, who was the chief figure at Nicæa, speaking of Hosius asks :

" Of what synod was he not president ?"[50]

He puts a similar remark into the mouth of the Arians when he refers to the influence of Hosius on the shaping of the Creed (a point which we shall deal with later).

> Οὗτος καί συνόδων καθηγεῖται καί γράφων ἀκούεται πανταχοῦ οὗτος καί τὴν ἐν Νικαίᾳ πίστιν ἐξέθετο.[51]

Theodoret uses similar language

> ποίας γὰρ οὐχ ἡγήσατο συνόδου.[52]

And Socrates, when he records the list of the chief members of the Council, puts Hosius first.

> " Hosius, Bishop of Cordova
> Vitus and Vincentius, priests of Rome
> Alexander, Bishop of Alexandria
> Eustathius, Bishop of Antioch
> Macarius, Bishop of Jerusalem."

Is Hosius put first because he is the representative of the pope ?[53]

It would seem so, even though, as has been held, he may primarily have owed his presidency at Nicæa to another title than that of delegate of the pope.

Tillemont has drawn attention to the signatures. " *Osius*

[49] *Vol. Act. Con. Nic.*, ii, 5. *P. G.*, lxxxv, 1179. Mansi, ii, 806.
[50] *Apol. de fuga. P. G.*, xxv, 649.
[51] *Hist. Arian. ad Monachos. P. G.*, xxv, 744.
[52] *H. E.*, ii, 15.
[53] In the light of what has been demonstrated as to the position of the see of Rome and what has been said about Sylvester already, I should find it very difficult to believe that any one other than Pope Sylvester would have presided at the Council of Nicæa if he had agreed to go to it.

When Eusebius, *Vit. Const.* iii, 3, says that " the prelate of the imperial city " was prevented by extreme old age from attending, but that his presbyters were present and supplied his place, it cannot mean the Bishop of Constantinople, which was not founded. And yet this is the " explanation " of Eusebius' words given in the notes of Socrates *H. E.*, in the *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers.*

est mis le premier dans les souscriptions communes du concile, mais sans aucune marque de légation ; au lieu que Vito et Vincent, qu'on met immédiatement après, déclarent qu'ils souscrivent au nom du vénérable Pape Sylvestre leur Evesque." [54]

But there is little in this objection, since the same can be said of the signature of Cyril of Alexandria at Ephesus, though the Acts of that Council more than once declare that he held the place of Pope Celestine.[55]

Yet Hosius and the two Roman priests evidently form one group, and though there are variations in the different manuscripts, in every case they sign first, and it is in these terms :

> " In the name of the Church of Rome, the Churches of Italy, Spain and all the West,"

the two Roman priests appearing as Hosius' attendants.[56]

Hefele cogently remarks : " In Mansi's two lists, it is true, nothing indicates that Hosius acted in the Pope's name, whilst we are informed that the two Roman priests did so. But this is not so surprising as it might at first sight appear, for these Roman priests had no right to sign for themselves : it was therefore necessary for them to say in whose name they did so ; whilst it was not necessary for Hosius, who as a bishop had a right of his own."[57]

It is difficult therefore to understand how a recent writer[58] can assert that " there is no contemporary trace " of papal endorsement.

How then is one to explain the presence of the papal *legates* Vitus and Vincentius σύνθεσθαι τοῖς πραττομένοις παρεγγυήσας as Theodoret relates ?[59]

How were they *legates*[60] if the pope had not sent them—unless he knew and approved ? How otherwise than as " papal endorsement " can the signatures to the decrees of Hosius and Vitus and Vincentius before all the other bishops be regarded ?

There might perhaps also be found a certain support for the contention that Hosius presided as the representative of the pope in the protest which Lucentius, the legate of Leo I, made at the

[54] Tillemont, *Mémoires pour servir*, vi, p. 808.
[55] See below on the Council of Ephesus and Mansi, iv, 14, 82.
[56] Mansi, ii, 692, 882, 927.
[57] Hefele i, p. 40, cf. too his remarks on p. 41.
[58] Dr. Sparrow Simpson, Art. in *Church Times* (20 May 1925).
[59] *H. E.*, i, 6. *P. G.*, lxxxii, 917.
[60] Döllinger, *Hist. of the Church, E. T.*, ii, 222 : " The right of presiding was conceded *without contradiction*, by all councils to the pope, in the person of his legates."
ibid., ii, 221 : " That at Nice, Hosius, Bishop of Cordova, and the priests Vitus and Vincentius presided as legates of the pope is clear."

Council of Chalcedon against Dioscorus, that the latter σύνοδον ἐτόλμησε ποιῆσαι ἐπιτροπῆς δίχα τοῦ ἀποστολικοῦ θρόνου ὅπερ οὐδέποτε γέγονεν. οὔδε ἔξον γένεσθαι.[61]

It is not altogether negligible that to-day in the "unchanging East" the Græco-Slave Liturgy thus addresses S. Sylvester—who, it should be borne in mind, *was not himself present at the Council.*

"Father Sylvester . . . . thou didst appear as a pillar of fire. ἱερῶς προηγούμενος ἱεροῦ συστήματος καὶ νεφέλη σκιάζουσα, snatching the faithful from the Egyptian error (*sc.* of Arius) and continually leading them *with unerring teachings to divine light.*" (ταῖς ἀπλανέσι διδαχαῖς ἑκάστοτε).

Or again, "as the divine κορυφαῖος . . . thou hast established (ἐκράτυνας) the most holy dogma, stopping the impious mouths of heretics.

O, Sylvester, thou didst scatter the whole body of the enemy warring against the preaching of the apostles.

Tongues that accorded together in error were brought to nought, O Wise One, *by the power of the Divine Spirit that wrought in thee* (πνεύματος τοῦ θείου τοῦ ἐν σοὶ ἐνεργοῦντος) and in one doxology to God the choirs of the faithful were united."[62]

[61] Mansi, vi, 581.

[62] N. Nilles, *Kalendarium.* (*Oeniponte*, 1879) p. 51.

In the *Synaxarion Const.* (Delehaye, 1902, p. 366) for January 2, where he is commemorated, Sylvester is described διὰ θείας ἐμφανείας τοῦ πανσέπτου ἀποστ. Πέτρου . . . . πλήθος πολὺ· τῶν Ἑλλήνων προσήγαγε. τῷ Χριστῷ.

See also Soloviev, *La Russie et l'Eglise Universelle* (p. 164–5, on S. Sylvester and Nicæa).

Worth recording are the words in which the Anglican Dr. H. Perceval thus describes the task of the Council of Nicæa: "The question the Fathers considered was not what they supposed Holy Scripture might mean, nor what they, from *a priori* arguments, thought would be consistent with the mind of God, but something entirely different, to wit, what they had received. . . . When the time came, in the fourth Council, to examine the *tome* of Pope S. Leo, the question was not whether it could be proved to the satisfaction of the assembled Fathers from the Holy Scriptures, but whether it was the traditional faith of the Church. It was not the doctrine of Leo in the fifth century, but the doctrine of Peter in the first, and of the Church since then, that they desired to believe and to teach."—*The Seven Œcumenical Councils, Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers.* cf. Appendix VII.

PART TWO

CHAPTER V

CONSTANTINE'S INTEREST IN THE CHURCH. THE BIRTH OF CÆSARO-PAPISM

THE year 330, when Constantine transformed Byzantium into Constantinople, and made it " New Rome " and the seat of his government, was the most momentous year in the history of the Eastern Churches, for soon began the struggle between the bishop of the new imperial city and the bishop of the old ; of one who based his claim to rank on the fact that he was bishop of the capital of the empire, against one who *never based his claim to pre-eminence on the fact that he was the bishop of the imperial city,*[1] but always and consistently on the fact that he was the successor[2] of Peter ; the ambition of the new see, and the often justified suspicion and jealousy of the old, developing till they issued in the lamentable schism under Photius.

An impartial study of these centuries makes it plain that the troubles of the Eastern Church were, at any rate, as often as not the result of her close alliance with, or dependence on, or subservience to the emperor and his court.

[1] " No doubt," remarks Duchesne, " she was the capital of the empire, and many have tried thus to explain the pre-eminence of her Church. Let us look into this question. First of all, the ecclesiastical traditions, which agree in recognising in the Bishops of Rome the successors of the Apostle Peter, and, as such, in acknowledging their eminent prerogatives, have *never once* alluded to those prerogatives as the result of the fact that the popes had their see in the capital, *but always as being inherent in the office of successors and vicars of S. Peter.* If there have been exceptions to this way of viewing things, they are only to be found in the Byzantine world, and only there by way of invidious comparison, introduced since the time of Theodosius, between the pontiffs of the new Rome and the popes of the ancient one."—*Churches Separated,* p. 82.

cf. Leo the Great, *sermo,* 82, and Schanz, *Apology,* iii, p. 495.

[2] It may here be recalled that Pope Boniface in the seventh century writes to the Emperor Phocas protesting against the ambition of Constantinople to get the first rank. His reasons are : that the seat of empire was first at Rome, and that Constantinople is only a Roman " colony " ; that the emperor calls himself Roman Emperor, not Emperor of Constantinople ; that the citizens of Constantinople call themselves Roman citizens, not Greek, and that Peter entrusted to the Bishop of Rome and to no other the keys and the power which Christ gave to him.

It is understandable to a certain extent that the bishop of the newly-created imperial city, hitherto merely Bishop of Byzantium—bishop of one of the smallest sees, not even a Metropolitan, but dependent on the exarchate of Heraclea in Thrace—should now hardly be content to remain always so.

In his desire to attain to patriarchal rank he could not lay claim for his see as other patriarchs did to apostolic foundation. But he would never have dreamt of advancing the preposterous claim (which we shall later see was sometimes advanced in the time of Photius) that the Apostle S. Andrew was the founder of his throne.[3]

The sole claim he made, the sole claim he could make,[4] to be the second of the patriarchs was that he was the bishop of the see where the Emperor dwelt, of the new capital, of "New Rome." It was simply the presence of the emperor and his court that ever made him think of it. As Dean Milman quite impartially and dispassionately remarks: "Constantinople was but a new city and had no pretensions to venerable or apostolic origin," and, speaking of a later time he continues: "It had attained, indeed, to the dignity of a patriarchate, but only by the decree of a recent council; in other respects it owed all its eminence to being the prelacy of New Rome, of the seat of empire."[5]

And it was regard not simply and solely for themselves and for their recognised primacy, but for the rights of the "apostolic" patriarchates of Alexandria and Antioch solemnly confirmed by the Church in council, that made the popes resist the desires, pretensions, and ambitions of the bishops of Constantinople.

And as for the emperors, it was not altogether disadvantageous from their point of view to have a bishop who could be amenable to their wishes; a seat of power in things ecclesiastical might, with advantage, be near at hand.

[3] In a polemical tract of Photius which is preserved in the collection "syntagma" of Rhallis and Potlis (Athens, 1854), entitled Πρὸς τοὺς λέγοντας ὡς ἡ Ῥώμη πρῶτος θρόνος Photius claims the first rank for Byzantium because Andrew was the πρωτόκλητος and older than Peter γενέσει πρότερον, and he even asserts that S. Andrew occupied the see of Byzantium long before Peter was Bishop of Rome! So Andrew has the advantage over his brother by three primacies—the primacy of age, the primacy of call, and the primacy of taking possession of his see! But no one ever heard of the last till the Acacian Schism (484–519), and the others have really nothing to do with the question. And see also Soloviev. *Op. cit.* p. 79–80.

[4] cf. J. Barmby in *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, note 1, p. 786. Art., "Gregorius I." "The city's civil importance, on which ground alone could any pre-eminence be claimed for Constantinople."

[5] *Hist. Lat. Christ.*, vol. i, p. 108 (1872).

If one looks at the plan of Constantinople, as Constantine laid it out, it strikes one that the emperor had placed the patriarch's palace significantly near his own.[6] " It was not one of the least cares of the prince," remarks Professor Diehl, " to be sure of his patriarch."[7]

When one recalls the vehemence of the protestations of the Easterns against the influence of Charlemagne in procuring the insertion of the *Filioque* in the Creed,[8] it is hard to be patient. One cannot but be struck with a certain feeling of their inconsistency as one studies the period of history with which we are dealing, and finds frequent evidence that what we now call " Erastianism " was her great blight and hindrance, and the most potent of the causes of the sundering of East and West.

. . . . .

To understand the Eastern mentality and its acquiescence in and its often enthusiastic support of " Cæsaro-papism," one has to recall that in ancient times the fulness of civil and religious power resided in one and the same person. The sovereign was also Pontifex Maximus. Such was the case, in some sense, with the early Jews, the Egyptians and the Assyrians. At Rome one could see the same man magistrate, general, and priest.[9] The kings of Rome were the natural heads of the national religion, as, later, the emperors likewise considered themselves.

When the world for the first time sees Christian emperors, these sovereigns do not at once entirely abandon the idea which has for so long been considered axiomatic : that the two powers, the civil and religious, are inseparably joined. The Christian religion, indeed, plainly shows the different spheres and independence of the two powers—" Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's and unto God the things that are God's."

[6] cf. C. Oman, *The Byzantine Empire*, pp. 21–2 : " A fine building in itself, with a spacious hall of audience and a garden, the patriarchal dwelling was yet completely overshadowed by the imperial palace which rose behind it. And so it was with the patriarch himself ; he lived too near his royal master to be able to gain any independent authority. Physically and morally alike, he was too much overlooked by his august neighbour, and never found the least opportunity of setting up an independent spiritual authority over against the civil government, or of founding an *imperium in imperio* like the Bishop of Rome." cf. J. Chapman, in *The Papacy*, p. 51, re the title, " Œcumenical Bishop."

[7] Diehl, *Byzance, Grandeur et Décadence*, p. 180.

[8] See below, p. 356, and also my *Anglo-Catholicism and Re-union*, p. 40 (1923).

[9] See Batiffol and Bréhier, *Op. cit.* p. 11, *Les survivances du culte impérial romain*, and de Corswarem, *La Liturgie Byzantine*, p. 59.

But it is in the gradual realisation of this principle that the struggle is witnessed.

It is often maintained that when Constantine legalised the practice of Christianity and removed its proscription he probably acted in his dual capacity as Pontifex Maximus, and chief of State, but that he had no idea of abandoning his pontifical prerogatives. It is indeed much later than Constantine's time that one hears of a pretended " Donation of Constantine." The evidence hardly points to the likelihood of any donation—rather it points in the other direction. He was not likely to hand over his pontifical power to the pope, for Constantine considered himself in some sense the head of the Christians; as hitherto he had been, and indeed still was, the Pontifex Maximus of the pagans. And it is as well once more to recall that Constantine was not yet a Christian, in the real sense. And he was not till his death-bed.[10]

Whatever may have inclined Constantine towards Christianity at the first, it is not altogether impossible that their obedience to the law, their respect for the " powers that be," the extraordinary absence of anything like revolt or conspiracy when persecution had been inflicted on them, influenced to some degree the Emperor towards cultivating the Christians. But he had ceased to believe in the pagan deities, though he considered it politic to tolerate and patronise their cult when it suited his purpose.

The victorious soldiers, according to their wont, had gone to the Capitol to return thanks to the gods for their aid in their successful campaign; and it is related that Constantine took the opportunity, not entirely tactfully perhaps, of showing his contempt for the national cults. The Emperor was soon made aware that his attitude had much displeased the people. He thought it best to begin afresh and in a new field. He would build a new city, where everything would be dependent on him and where the religion which he thought alone worthy might predominate.[11] But paganism and pagan temples were by no means absent from the new capital, and if Constantine builds

[10] It is charitable to remember this when the vision of his murdered wife and son rise up before one's mind: and cf. Soloviev, *Op. cit.* p. xxiv, *seq.* But Mgr. Batiffol, *Les survivances du culte impérial romain*, p. 14, speaks of " *Constantin chrétien convaincu sinon encore baptisé.*"

[11] Of course there were other great reasons for his change of capital, but this is the one which chiefly concerns our subject. There were reasons political, strategic, and economic. See Diehl, *Histoire de l'Empire Byzantine*, p. 1–3. Oman, *The Byzantine Empire* (1892), pp. 15–16, and N. H. Baynes, *The Byzantine Empire* (1925), chap. i, p. 11, *seq.* cf. Zosimus, Bk. 11 and Gasquet, *De l'autorité impériale en matière religieuse à Byzance*" (1879), p. 23; and Gibbon (Ed. Bury) *Decline and Fall.*

a church he also contributes to the rearing of a temple, while pagan symbols and statues are not unknown in his city and pagan titles on his coins.[12] Paganism is tolerated so long as it does not offend against manners and morals.[13]

Constantine, then, still clung to his title Pontifex Maximus, although he had long ceased to have any belief in the images. He was "*Détaché mentalement du polythéisme et rallié à la summa divinitas.*"[14]

"The year 324–325 marks a time of strengthened faith on his part in the God of the Christians. The labarum enters on the scene in his campaign against Licinius. He has it on the reverse of his coins with the lower end of its staff piercing the serpent. He himself is shown, eyes to heaven in the attitude of prayer."

"It is not a matter of indifference to us," remarks a recent historian,[15] "to note down these signs of public faith, the year when the city is founded and receives its name, or to recall the place which devotion to Christ held in the religion of Constantine,[16] however confused and rudimentary his personal Christology may have been."

It is a curious picture, that of Constantine tracing out, as if he were guided by the Divinity (just as the Cæsars before him were accustomed to do), the outline of his new city, accompanied by the soothsayer Valens, the philosopher Sopater, the pontiff Prætextatus. "Pure tolerance," maintains the same writer, who would liken Constantine's action to that of a Catholic general being present at the prayers of his Mussulman troops. And apparently there were sacrifices and libations and processions in honour of the tutelary gods.

There seems little real difference in privileges and external act, between his attitude towards the Christian clergy and the

[12] See *Echos d'Orient* (July 1924), Art., "La Consécration et la Dédicace de Constantinople" (David Lathoud), pp. 294–5 and p. 314. Batiffol, however, maintains that there was no pagan temple and that the statues of the gods which were transported there were only to decorate the city. And he quotes Augustine, *De. Civ. Dei.*, v. 25, in support (*La Paix Constantinienne*, p. 360). But cf. Gasquet, *Op. cit.* p. 26, of the temples raised to "Peace" and "Wisdom," which were the counterpart of the Hagia Sophia and Irene Churches, and the medals struck in honour of the prince: "*Soli invicto comiti, Jovis conservatoris, Martis propugnatoris.*" cf. Bréhier, *Les survivances du culte impérial romain*, p. 37.

[13] See Batiffol and Bréhier, *Op. cit.* p. 14.

[14] "*Les Etapes de la conversion de Constantin*," in the *Bulletin d'ancienne littérature*, etc. (1913), p. 261—Batiffol.

[15] D. Lathoud, *Echos d'Orient* (July 1924), "La Consécration et la Dédicace de Constantinople," p. 314.

[16] cf. Batiffol, *La Paix Constantinienne*, p. 400.

pagan priesthood.[17] All through his life he considers himself the Pontifex Maximus of both.

Although he professed to disapprove of the curious ceremony of the apotheosis, yet following the custom of his predecessors he decreed it for his father Constantius Chlorus, and his own funeral rites approached very closely in their excess and elaboration the obsequies of his parent.[18]

It is all an illustration of the "cultus" of the sovereign—a significant instance of the extraordinary regard that the Byzantines paid to their emperors. It explains much of their docility in allowing them, without protest, to interfere so intimately in matters religious, which lay beyond their province.

The Emperor Constantine, as Professor Diehl puts it "*Du pouvoir impérial . . . . s'efforça de faire une autorité absolue et de droit divin.*"[19] His pomp, his etiquette, his ceremonial, his robes in which he indulged, had for their object the showing forth of the earthly royalty as the image of the royalty divine.

Christianity was made the State religion, and that meant an increase in the prestige of imperial power. Its establishment emphasised the imperial authority. And so Constantine took his seat among the bishops, sitting as one of them. This catechumen looked upon himself as the divinely-appointed guardian and protector of its doctrine and discipline, concerned with all branches of its activity, calling its councils, presiding at or directing them. And his successors—often heretical though they were—did the same. Here is the beginning of "Cæsaro-papism," that despotic authority of the emperors over the Church, that tyranny, which the Eastern clergy—courteous, ambitious, worldly, docile, easily influenced—will accept so often without protest.

The Byzantine Church becomes looked upon simply as the "double" of the State. It is the Byzantine empire simply regarded from the viewpoint of religion ; the spiritual power is simply the reverse of the civil power.[20]

[17] D. Lathoud, "La Consécration et la Dédicace de Constantinople," in the *Echos d'Orient*, Sept. 1924, p. 295.

[18] See Batiffol, *La Paix Constantinienne*, p. 296, and Eusebius, *Vit. Const.* iv, 69, 73. See *Les survivances du culte impérial romain*," pp. 6, 17, 27–8.

[19] C. Diehl, *L' Empire Byzantin*, p. 3.

[20] Religion in the East was a national affair. And one finds this true not only of the Orthodox, but of the heretics. That is brought out from a consideration of the heresies. The Nestorians of Chaldea, the Monophysites of Egypt, of Abyssinia, of Syria and of Armenia, owe also their survival to the nationalist spirit rather than to profound theological studies. Cf. an interesting chapter on "Les origines des schismes Orientaux et Byzantins" in a recent (1924) brochure, *L'Unité de l'Eglise*, by Ch. Quenet. See also Pargoire, *L'Eglise Byzantine*, pp. 1, 3, 7.

Here is the root of the Third Canon of Constantinople I, and the twenty-eighth Canon of Chalcedon. Here is an explanation of that proneness to, and easy acceptance of, a state of schism with the West ; indeed, here, once again, is the chief clue to the final great schism of Photius.

. . . . . .

Many historians have seen in the advances of Constantine towards Christianity simply the calculated policy of the statesman. It was more than that.[21] What the religion of the youthful Constantine was we do not know,[22] yet he was really and conscientiously drawn to the Christian religion, though he progressed by stages, and Mgr. Batiffol does well to bring this out by using such expressions, e.g. as " his ' first ' conversion " (306-312). Political considerations were secondary, though it need not be denied that Constantine was fully aware of the advantage and support that Christianity would give to the State.

To review the Christian evolution of Constantine : The Christians were becoming a very powerful section of the community —constantly and rapidly growing ; and their religion which inculcated so markedly obedience to the Civil power [23] was well calculated to favour the despotism which was his conception of sovereignty. At the same time one is probably right in expressing doubt as to whether the Christians were so numerous as has been generally held.[24]

The victory at the Milvian Bridge (312) is followed by the Edict of Milan (313) and in this he speaks of the *summa divinitas.*[25] It shows a further stage in the religious development of Constantine. Polytheism is rejected ; there is one God and this God is the God of the Christians. To Him (as he shows in his epistles to Anulinus pro-consul of Africa) he ascribes the success of his arms, the great prosperity of the Roman name, success in all human affairs, and constant favours. Christianity is the only religion which is worthy of the Divinity. He repeats : the adoption of Christianity assures prosperity to the Roman name. " *Théodicée quelque peu judaïque, sans doute,*" truly remarks Batiffol, " *mais qui vaut ici comme expression de l'expérience religieuse de Constantin en personne.*" [26]

[21] Batiffol, *Op. cit.* p. 257.

[22] See Bréhier, *Les survivances du culte impérial romain,* p. 37.

[23] cf. Batiffol and Bréhier, *Les survivances du culte impérial romain,* p. 7.

[24] *Op. cit.* p. 215. Eusebius, *Vit. Const.* i, 27, and *Les survivances du culte impérial romain,* p. 23.

[25] Batiffol and Bréhier, *Op. cit.* p. 37.

[26] *Ibid.,* p. 251. cf. p. 254 of his letter to Cecilian " *aucune allusion au Christ.*"

"The Emperor Constantine," says Socrates, "seeing the Church torn by the quarrels of Arians and Christians, assembles an œcumenical council and sends orders by letters to the bishops of every place to betake themselves to Nicæa in Bithynia."[27]

Constantine, because he was Emperor, believed himself to be for the Christians a bishop among bishops, just as for the pagans he was pontiff among pontiffs. "He sat among them," says Eusebius, "as if he were one of them," and when he despatched the Canons of Nicæa to the bishops he wrote: "I myself sat in the Council as one of you."[28] His words are famous: Ἀλλ' ὑμεῖς μὲν τῶν εἴσω τῆς Ἐκκλησίας, ἐγώδε τῶν δ' ἐκτὸς ὑπὸ θεοῦ καθεσταμένος ἐπίσκοπος; not that it ever entered his head to administer the sacraments, but he conceived himself as having a power of supervision, of coercion, of giving the force of law to the dogmatic decrees and canons of councils.[29]

The convocation and course of the Council of Nicæa constitute a momentous "point of departure" as to the relation of the Emperor to the Church. It is by no means easy to determine the precise significance that Constantine assigned to this interesting of himself in the conduct of the First Œcumenical Council. But it cannot be that members of the episcopate were altogether without misgiving at this participating so intimately in things ecclesiastical. It must be stressed again that the idea of the separation of the civil and ecclesiastical powers is an essential of Christianity—it is part of its very constitution. But after the period of persecution which they had endured, Christians hardly felt themselves equal to contesting, with an emperor who had given them peace, what he considered an essential prerogative of his power—"they felt they were too much at the mercy of his caprice to attack his dogma of empire." So the Easterns relapsed into silence, forgetfulness, or acquiescence; the Westerns would be kept aware of this principle of their religion by the papacy which accepted it and preserved it.[30]

Athanasius assures us that no pressure was brought to bear on the members towards their decision, but that all followed their conscience in vindicating the truth.[31]

But Constantine will not be always so self-effacing. His influence in Church affairs will be very active. He will be by

[27] Socrates, *H. E.*, i, 5.
[28] Eusebius, *Vit. Const.* iii, 23.
[29] cf. P. Allard, *Le Christianisme et l'Empire Romain*, p. 167.
[30] See Gasquet *De l'Autorité impériale*, p. 47. cf. a lucid passage in *The Papacy*, p. 37, A. L. Maycock (London 1927).
[31] *Ath. ep. ad Aegyp.*

no means content to play the rôle of a mere watcher from outside.[32]

When Arius had been condemned by his patriarch, Alexander, he had betaken himself to Asia Minor to spread his doctrines there.

Very considerable success had attended his efforts. By a work which he entitled *Thalia* (now known to us only by fragments quoted in the writings of Athanasius) and by songs which he wrote for sailors, millers and other such workers,[33] he popularised his teaching. It became talked of everywhere; even the pagans found it vastly amusing to see ridiculed on their stage these differences and disputes among professing Christians. But he made one convert or adherent of special note—Eusebius, Bishop of Nicomedia.

This man and his career are the key to much in the struggles that followed. As Duchesne says, "*La mémoire de ce prélat intrigant, chez lequel on ne relève aucun trait sympathique, demeure chargée d'une lourde responsabilité.*"[34] He was a distant connection of the Emperor. It was indeed at Eusebius' hands that Constantine at the end of his life received baptism.

He, too, it was who gave his name to the influential, active party of Arians—the "Eusebians."

Ambition was the outstanding characteristic of Eusebius.[35] Bishop of Berytus in Phoenicia, he contrived somehow to get himself translated to Nicomedia when Licinius the colleague of Constantine resided there, and now, bishop of so important a city, he schemed to lessen the prestige and authority of Alexandria and Antioch, whose jurisdiction extended the one over all Egypt, the other over the "diocese" of the East.

He found in the Arian heresy just the instrument suited to his purpose against Alexandria, and he only too gladly espoused the cause of the heretical Alexandrian clergy excommunicated by their bishop, Alexander.

Constantine came to Nicomedia in 323, after he had defeated the revolted Licinius, and this new trouble was, as we have

[32] See an important passage in a recent work: "*Il nous faut aujourd'hui un effort de réflexion pour comprendre toute la portée d'un évènement aussi capital que la conversion de Constantin au Christianisme. C'est par une véritable révolution que l'empereur, providence visible, Dieu terrestre, maître du monde, est devenu un fidèle de la religion du Christ,*" etc. Bréhier, *Les survivances du culte impérial romain*, pp. 35–6.

See also R. Janin, the Introduction to *Les Eglises orientales et les Rites orientaux*, pp. 4–5 (1926).

[33] Philostorgius, *H. E.*, ii, 1.

[34] *Hist. anc. de l'Eglise*, ii, 212.

[35] cf. Chapman, *Art. cit.*, p. 95.

seen, a keen annoyance to him, so desirous of tranquillity and unity. Then came the Council of Nicæa, and Eusebius, though he indeed signed the Symbol and consented to the condemnation and deposition of Arius, continued to favour the Arians, till at last Constantine was constrained to send him into exile too.

But owing to the influence of his Arian sister, Constantia, the widow of Licinius, Constantine had become more and more favourable to the Arians. As she lay dying her great request was that her brother should be merciful to the exiled followers of Arius. This was in 328, and it was the year that saw Athanasius become patriarch of Alexandria. And so, after three years absence, Eusebius came back to resume his activities in a sphere where their influence could be more strongly felt.

And more and more Constantine allowed himself to fall under Arian influences, so that, as Jerome says, "*in arianum dogma declinat a quo usque ad praesens tempus ecclesiarum rapinae et totius orbis est secuta discordia,*" and when Batiffol[36] complains of Constantine's having treated as non-existent the primacy of Rome one has the explanation here.

[36] *Op. cit.*, p. 400. "*L'oligarchie arienne . . . . s'institua comme si elle avait quelque titre à parler au nom de Catholicisme.*" cf. *ibid.*, p. 360.

CHAPTER VI

ATHANASIUS, PATRIARCH OF ALEXANDRIA (328-373)

It was a foregone conclusion that Athanasius, the greatest influence in the Council of Nicæa, should succeed to the patriarchal throne on the death of Alexander. But of the forty-five years that Athanasius was to rule the second see of Christendom no one dreamt that a third was to be spent in five exiles. Happily it would be given to the most famous of the Greek Fathers[1] to return to pass the last seven years of his life reigning in his see-city, the city of his birth.

. . . . .

It is not necessary to recount all the history of the Arian controversy in order to show the unique place the Roman see held during those tedious years.

One or two instances in the struggle will suffice to manifest, in the relations of East and West, the primacy of Rome; and to demonstrate the belief in the primacy of the Roman bishop on the part of S. Athanasius, the greatest of the Greek Fathers.

Athanasius of Alexandria, in spite of all efforts to move him, was absolutely adamant in his refusal to receive back the exiled Arius, the former priest of Alexandria. Charges wicked and at the same time ridiculous were brought against him. Constantine held a council[2] at Tyre (335). Athanasius at first attended. He had little difficulty in refuting the lies of the Arians, and dramatically vindicated himself. But the Eusebians declared him "deposed." The bishops of this synod then went on to Jerusalem for the dedication of Constantine's new Church of the Anastasias, and Arius was received back into communion by them. Athanasius meanwhile went to Constantinople to appeal to Constantine.

. . . . .

Athanasius himself has told us how, during the Meletian

[1] For Athanasius, see the masterly article by X. Le Bachelet in *D. T. C.*, *t.* i, col. 2143, *seq.*, "Saint Athanase."

[2] Batiffol, *Op. cit.*, p. 380. *Le concile de Tyr ouvre la série de conciles grecs auxquels l'histoire ecclésiastique donnera le nom de brigandages.*

troubles in Egypt, Eusebius had tried both persuasion and threats to induce him to admit the Arians to communion. When Athanasius refused, declaring that it was not right to receive those who had been "anathematised by an Œcumenical council," there arrived for him from Nicomedia, a letter from Constantine himself, "Having therefore knowledge of my will," wrote the Emperor, "grant free admission to all who wish to enter the Church. For if I learn that you have hindered or excluded any who claim to be admitted into communion with the Church, I will immediately send some one who shall depose you by my command, and shall remove you from your place."[3]

In view of such an experience, one may wonder that Athanasius, so self-reliant and so courageous, took the trouble after the ridiculous Council of Tyre, to waylay Constantine as he was returning on horseback to the city, in order to demand that his accusers and himself be brought face to face and heard before the Emperor. "*On doit se demander pourtant si Athanase a été bien inspiré en demandant justice au prince,*" remarks Mgr. Batiffol, "*et s'il n'a pas ce jour-là fait au césaropapisme naissant une concession qu'il dut regretter.*"[4]

The same historian in an article, "Les recours à Rome en Orient avant le concile de Chalcédoine,"[5] quotes with approval Mgr. Duchesne,[6] "*Athanase, déposé par le concile de Tyr, ne paraît pas avoir eu l'idée qu'un appel à Rome pourrait rétablir ses affaires,*" and he comments, "*Il est certain qu'Athanase à Tyr s'embarque, non pas pour Rome, mais pour Constantinople. Cette détermination s'explique par le fait que, à pareille date, il n'y avait pas d'exemple connu d'un recours porté à Rome par un évêque d'Orient condamné par un concile d'Orient.*" On this one may remark that there may not indeed be any known example of such an appeal, but that there had been appeals to Rome seems to me evident from Pope Julius' words (see below p. 105). "Are you ignorant that the custom (ἔθος) has been for word to be written first to us, and then for a just sentence to be passed from this place?" (οὕτως ἔνθεν).[7]

Batiffol rightly emphasises "*Dans le cas présent, Athanase a comparu devant le concile de Tyr sur l'ordre de Constantin, ce concile même a été convoqué par Constantin, et il est présidé par un commissaire impérial*": As Mgr. Batiffol had before noted,

[3] *Athan. Apol.*, 59–60.
[4] *La Paix Constantinienne*, p. 385.
[5] *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique*, Louvain, *t.* xxi, F. 1 (1925), p. 7.
[6] *Hist. Anc.*, ii, p. 660.
[7] cf. also the statements of the Greeks Sozomen and Socrates (below p. 105).

" C'était une accusation d'ordre public dont l'empereur se considérait comme le juge." To resume : *Athanase doit recourir à Constantin contre la partialité du concile, et c'est ce qu'il fait."*

Now the observations which Dom. Chapman[8] makes on this recourse of Athanasius to Constantine are of considerable importance and cogency, and his reasoning seems to me conclusive. Athanasius was accused of civil crimes which Constantine himself referred to the Council of Tyre. " It was natural . . .to fly to Constantinople, accost the Emperor and complain that the Council had violated every law of justice[9]. If Constantine could be persuaded that the council had not even heard the defence, there would be no reason to appeal to Rome. To make such an appeal from the Council was to appeal in a criminal case from the Emperor to the Pope. This might be proper in the middle ages : but the idea that a bishop could not be tried by secular judges was new to the law, and it was Constantine himself who had originally granted the privilege : he had now chosen this particular way of applying it to Athanasius. Had the latter been tried for ecclesiastical offences by an ecclesiastical court, his appeal would have been to Rome ; but he was tried for crimes by a court of bishops in council who represented the Emperor, and his appeal was to the Emperor, if he could get at him. The Pope could not reverse the Emperor's decision . . . and it was no more useful to appeal to the Pope . . . . except in so far as the pious Constantine might have listened to the Pope's representations, if the latter thought justice had not been done. . . . I do not suppose it entered S. Julius's head to remonstrate with the first Christian emperor, who had dealt with a bishop as a man guilty of some of the crimes attributed to him or at least a cause of trouble and strife."

. . . . .

The Emperor exiled Athanasius to distant Trèves (335-337). Meanwhile preparations were made solemnly to receive back into communion Arius at Constantinople. But death has never more dramatically intervened to frustrate man's schemes—when, by the sudden taking of Arius it spared the pious Alexander, Bishop of Constantinople, the humiliation of having to receive one whom he looked upon as a miserable blasphemer.[10]

The Eusebians were rapidly nullifying what had been accomplished at the Council of Nicæa. Alexandria was vacant by the

[8] *Art. cit.*, pp. 106–8.

[9] J. Chapman, *Loc. cit.*, writes : " There is nothing in S. Julius either to suggest that S. Athanasius might have appealed to him ; nor that the pope could have intervened to prevent his exile to Trèves."

[10] See pp. 268–270, Newman's *Arians of the Fourth Century*.

exile of Athanasius, Antioch by their machinations in getting Eustathius dethroned, while Constantinople was now passing into the control of Eusebius as bishop himself (338 or 339). Thus the three chief sees of the East were in their hands.

With the death of Constantine (337) came the restoration of exiled bishops ; and so Athanasius returned to Alexandria (338).

But the succession of Constantius, a semi-Arian, as Emperor of the East and eventually as sole emperor (353-361)[11] was another circumstance of enormous favour for the minimising or compromising policy of the Eusebians. They were even so bold as to set up an anti-bishop at Alexandria—an early disciple of Arius, one Pistos (339).

And they wrote not only to the three emperors to state their accusations against Athanasius, but also to the pope to ask recognition of Pistos by Rome.

Pope Julius, to the Eusebians' discomfort, sent to Athanasius information of the charges that had been made against him. The latter thereupon held a council at Alexandria, and as a result there was sent to all the bishops of the Church a long Defence.[12]

When the messengers from Alexandria got to Rome they found there the envoys of the Eusebians. One of these, a priest Macarius, hurriedly departed, and the two deacons who were left behind thought it best to ask that a council should be held with Pope Julius himself as judge.[13] Julius therefore summoned both the accused and his accusers to Rome.

But the Eusebians were by no means desirous of meeting Athanasius face to face in Rome ; and, allowing considerable time to elapse, they met at length at Antioch, where they put together a letter " very elegant, but full of irony and threats " which was despatched to the pope. They were not specially anxious for a Roman council, seeing that their council at Antioch,which they affected to believe quite lawful, had decided everything. 'If Julius still refused to recognise their decisions and persisted in remaining in communion with those whom they had expelled, they themselves would not receive the pope to communion.' Sozomen gives the substance of their letter thus :[14]

[11] Constantine II was given Gaul, and Constans Illyricum and Italy. In 340 Constantine II was defeated and killed by Constans. In 350 Constans was defeated and killed by Magentius, a usurper, who in 353 was slain by Constantius. Thus the latter became sole emperor.

[12] *Athan. Apol.*, 3–19.

[13] *Athan. Apol.*, 20. *P. G.*, xxv, 279. cf. Socrates, *H. E.*, ii, 11. Sozomen, *H. E.*, iii. 7. *Athan. Hist. Arian ad. mon. Athan. Apol.*, 22.

[14] Sozomen, *H. E.*, iii, 8. *P. G.*, lxvii (1055).

" They confessed in this epistle that the Church of Rome was entitled to universal honour, because it was the school of the apostles, and had become the metropolis of piety from the outset, although the introducers of the doctrine had settled there from the East. They added that the second place in point of honour ought not to be assigned to them, because they did not have the advantage of size or number in their churches ; for they excelled the Romans in virtue and determination. They called Julius to account for having admitted the followers of Athanasius into communion, and expressed their indignation against him for having insulted their synod and abrogated their decrees, and they assailed his transactions as unjust and discordant with ecclesiastical right. After these censures and protestations against such grievances, they proceeded to state that if Julius would acknowledge the deposition of the bishops whom they had expelled, and the substitution of those whom they had ordained in their stead, they would promise peace and fellowship ; but that, unless he would accede to these terms, they would openly declare their opposition. They added that the priests who had preceded them in the government of the Eastern churches had offered no opposition to the deposition of Novatian by the Church of Rome. They made no allusion in their letter to any deviations they had manifested from the doctrines of the Council of Nicæa, but merely stated they had various reasons to allege in justification of the course they had pursued, and that they considered it unnecessary to enter at that time upon any defence of their conduct, as they were suspected of having violated justice in every respect."

In spite of this effrontery Julius waited, and then at last held his council without them (340), though there were bishops from Thrace, Palestine, Phoenicia and Coelesyria, besides priests from Alexandria and Egypt, together with Athanasius[15] and Marcellus of Ancyra.

For Athanasius had obeyed the summons with alacrity. " He sought refuge in Rome," says Jerome, " as in a most safe

cf. also Chapman, *Art. cit. Downside Review*, pp. 95–96, and Batiffol, Art., "Les recours à Rome en Orient," in *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique* (Jan. 1925), p. 10.

[15] cf. Batiffol *ibid*, p. 11.

Mais à ce concile prit part Athanase, qui évidemment estimait le concile de Rome compétent dans sa cause, même après la carence des Orientaux. Athanase répudiait donc la doctrine des Eusébiens qui contestaient cette compétence.

harbour of his communion," for Alexandria was in a state of turmoil consequent on the intrusion by Constantius of another bishop, of course an Arian, Gregory of Cappadocia.

" The pope," writes Prof. C. H. Turner, " earned the special gratitude of all Catholic Christians by giving audience to the protest of Athanasius against his synodical condemnation in the East."[16] Theodoret[17] in his History thus comments :

> " Athanasius, knowing their plot, retired and betook himself to the West. For the Eusebians had sent the calumnies which they had put together against Athanasius to the Bishop of Rome (Julius was then shepherd of that Church). Julius following the law of the Church, both ordered them to come to Rome and also summoned the divine Athanasius to judgment. And Athanasius, for his part, started at once on receiving the call. But they who had made up the story did not go to Rome, knowing that it would be easy to see through their falsehood."[18]

The pope despatched a synodal letter to the Eusebians. Julius wrote in no weak terms, because, although they had themselves written to him and asked for a council with himself as judge,[19] they had violated the canons, held their own council, and condemned Athanasius without hearing him. The pope wrote :

> " Charging them," says Socrates, " with a violation of the canons, in neglecting to request his attendance at the council, seeing that by ecclesiastical law no decisions of the Churches are valid unless sanctioned by the Bishop of Rome."[20]

Athanasius has preserved the letter of Pope Julius in his " Apology " as being his most important document. He could hardly have done so unless he consented to the claims which the pope there made :

> " Supposing, as you assert, that some offence rested upon those persons (*sc.* Athanasius and Marcellus) the case ought to have been conducted against them, not after this manner, but according to the canon of the Church. Word should have been written of it to us all, that so a just sentence might

[16] C. H. Turner, *Journal of Theological Studies* (1902), p. 389. Art., " The Genuineness of the Sardican Canons."

[17] *H. E.*, ii, 3. *P. G.*, lxxxii, 996. cf. Sozomen, iii, 10. *Athan. Apol.* 20, and *Hist. Arian.* 11.

[18] cf. Chapman, *Art. cit.*, p. 95.

[19] *Apolog. contr. Arian.*, 20. *P. G.*, xxv, 279.

[20] Socrates, *H. E.*, ii, 17 ; lxvii, 220.

proceed from all. For the sufferers were bishops and Churches of no ordinary note, but those which the apostles themselves had governed in their own persons. And why was nothing said to Us concerning the Church of Alexandria in particular? Are you ignorant (ἀγνωεῖτε) that the custom (ἔθος) has been for word to be written first to Us, and then for a just sentence to be passed from this place? (οὕτως ἔνθεν)[21] If then any such suspicion rested upon the bishop there, notice ought to have been sent to the Church of this place, whereas, after neglecting to inform us and proceeding on their own authority as they pleased, now they desire to obtain our concurrence in their decisions, though we never condemned him. Not so have the constitutions (διατάξεις) of Paul, not so have the traditions of the Fathers directed. . . . *For what we have received from the blessed Apostle Peter, that I signify to you.*"[22]

The writings of Constantinopolitan historians of the fifth century, Socrates and Sozomen, when relating the events of the century before, contain some passages very pertinent to our enquiry. Their remarks show us how papal claims were viewed by Easterns in the fifth century and in the fourth. Socrates is speaking of the summoning of Athanasius and Marcellus to Rome, and he writes:

"There each laid his case before Julius, Bishop of Rome, who sent them back again into the East, restoring them to their respective sees by virtue of his letters, in the exercise of the Church of Rome's peculiar privilege, and at the same time in the liberty of that prerogative, sharply rebuking those by whom they had been deposed."[23]

This passage is paralleled by the other Greek historian, Sozomen, who records:

[21] *Athan. Apol.* 36. *P. G.*, xxv, 303. Dr. Brightman objected to the translation ἐνθεν=from hence. I submitted his contention that it was "of time" to Dom J. Chapman, who replied (June 11, 1925): "Pope Julius says καὶ οὕτως ἔνθεν. If you take ἔνθεν of *time* or rather *consequence*, you get a pleonasm—"and so in consequence," or, "and so thereafter." Hence the right translation is presumably "and so from hence." But it makes no earthly difference."

See also Batiffol, *Les Recours à Rome en Orient*, p. 13. See also p. 12, *ibid.*

[22] cf. S. Leo. *Serm.* iii, 3. "(*Petri*) *in Sede sua vivit potestas et excellit auctoritas.*" cf. words of Council of Arles (see above p.). This is the first example extant of a pope speaking of himself as the mouthpiece of Peter. However, documents of earlier days are scarce, and of letters there are only one of Pope Clement and a few of Pope Cornelius.

[23] Socrates, *H. E.*, ii, 15. *P. G.*, lxvii, 212.

" The Roman bishop, on learning the accusation against each individual, and on finding that they held the same sentiments about the Nicæan dogmas, admitted them to communion as of like orthodoxy ; and as the case for all was fitting to the dignity of his see he restored them all to their own Churches."[24]

And, says Sozomen elsewhere, when relating that the Bishop of Rome wrote to the bishops of Egypt in favour of Athanasius :

" he (*sc.* Julius) alleged that there is a sacerdotal canon which declares that whatever is enacted contrary to the judgment of the Bishop of Rome is null."[25]

If it be objected that Socrates and Sozomen in the first two quotations from their Histories given above were simply recording Julius' view, the following quotation shows that it was also the view of these Easterns themselves :

" Neither was Julius, Bishop of Ancient Rome, there (*sc.* at Antioch) nor did he indeed send a representative ; although the ecclesiastical canon expressly commands that the Churches shall not make any ordinances without the sanction of the bishop of Rome."[26]

Dr. Brightman thought the testimony of " two lawyers " of little value. In this he agrees with Prof. Glubokovsky, who would combat the following words of Mgr. Batiffol in a recent article.[26a] " *Nous avons la preuve que, à Constantinople, autour de* 440, *on les tenait pour réguliers, puisque, à propos du recours à Rome de Saint Athanase déposé par les Ariens, les deux historiens grecs, tous deux hommes de loi, tous deux de Constantinople, Socrate et Sozomène, ce dernier bien en cour auprès de l'empereur*

[24] Sozomen, *H. E.*, iii, 8. *P. G.*, lxvii, 1052.
cf. also Chapman, *Art. cit.*, p. 95–96.

[25] Sozomen, *H. E.*, iii, 10. *P. G.*, lxvii, 1057.

[26] Socrates, ii, 8. *P. G.*, lxvii. As a matter of fact, there is no written document existing containing this canon. Socrates, anyhow, refers to a principle existing and universally acknowledged. He is not quoting from any other writer. He is giving the rule as it was accepted at Constantinople in the fifth century. Καίτοι κανόνος ἐκκλησιατικοῦ κελεύοντος, μὴ δεῖν παρὰ τὴν γνώμην τοῦ ἐπισκόπου Ῥώμης τὰς ἐκκλησίας κανονίζειν.

[26a] Batiffol, "Papal Rome and the Orthodox East," in *The Christian East* (February, 1924).
cf. Harnack's note on p. 226, vol. iii, of *History of Dogma* : " Very characteristic in this respect (*sc.* ' special dignity being possessed by the Roman bishops ') are the Church Histories of Socrates and Sozomen, who on this point are free from partiality, and reflect the universal opinion. But it does not occur to them to doubt that the Roman Bishop had a special authority and a unique relation to the whole Church (see e.g. Socrat., ii, 8, 15, 17 ; *Soz.*, iii, 8 ; also Theodoret's letter to Leo I)."

Théodose II déclare que c'est une loi ecclésiastique que soit invalide tout ce qui est prononcé contre la volonté de l'évêque de Rome : Μὴ δεῖν παρὰ γνώμην τοῦ ἐπισκόπου Ῥώμης κανονίζειν τὰς ἐκκλησίας[26b]

" Si, comme le suppose M. Harnack cette règle a été formulée par le pape Jules (Dogmengeschichte, t. ii, p. 102), *combien il est remarquable que, cent ans plus tard, elle soit mentionée comme un canon organique de l'Eglise par les deux historiens grecs de l'Eglise du temps de Theodose II !"*[27]

I failed to see that the fact that Socrates and Sozomen were lawyers was anything against them, and submitted Dr. Brightman's objections to Dom J. Chapman, who replied (11 June, 1925), entirely confirming my contention. " That two historians at Constantinople should exaggerate like lawyers making up a case, in favour of the papal prerogatives, would be a curious anomaly. It is more natural to suppose that they record what they took to be facts. It is rather awkward for ' Gallican ' views that these writers should speak as they do of the Church's Κανών'; but if they were lawyers, their evidence would be the more remarkable."

But no such objection is possible in the case of Athanasius. The insertion of Julius' letter in his Apology alone shows that he admitted the claims of Pope Julius. He knew perfectly well what the Pope was asserting of himself. He nowhere denies or contests Julius' claims. He utilises them. Why ? There can be only one answer—because he believed in them.

Even if Socrates and Sozomen are made[28] to be merely reporting the pleas of the Pope, that objection cannot possibly be urged against Athanasius.

[26b] Socrat., II, 17.

[27] Prof. Glubokovsky replies to Mgr. Batiffol in the December, 1924 number of *The Christian East.* Art., " Papal Rome and Orthodox East." These are his words (p. 157) : " But—and this is most important—this is only a private opinion, and in order to represent it *comme un canon organique (?!) de l'Eglise,* Mgr. P. Batiffol is compelled to have recourse to Prof. Harnack's subjective supposition that it reproduces a formula of Pope Julius I, the very pope who was most categorically opposed by the Eastern Fathers on the ground that he, being haughty with the greatness of his see, had meddled in other people's affairs to no purpose and illegally (on the question about S. Athanasius). But, even admitting this doubtful hypothesis, we have only a pope's opinion and not the canonical norm of the Eastern Church. Further, Socrates is not a Church authority. More, *he is not a theologian, he is a notary, an advocate.* Therefore his expressions, though juridically categorical, are exaggerated in a theological sense and are lacking in precision in a canonical sense," etc.

[28] cf. Gore, *Roman Catholic Claims,* p. 101. Though the Pope " restored each to their sees," by giving the exiles letters authorising restoration to their bishoprics, it is not improbable (Constantius being so strong a supporter of the Eusebian brand of Arianism) that they were unable to take possession.

Athanasius spent three years in Rome. Meanwhile the Emperor Constans and the Pope both looked forward to a council to put an end to the unedifying wrangles we have witnessed. The Emperor Constans, unlike his brother Constantius, was orthodox, and, at the request of the bishops assembled at Milan, urged Constantius to send the Eastern bishops to Sardica (the modern Sofia), just within the territory of Constans, that a council might be held to bring about the peace of the Church. The council met in 343, under the presidency of Hosius, Bishop of Cordova, and Athanasius gives a list of countries from which the bishops came.[29] They came from East and West.

The Eusebians, indignant that the council would not take for granted the deposition of Athanasius, suddenly discovered that the Persian war made their presence at home imperative. They stopped, however, at Philippopolis, just on the other side of the border, and held a council of their own.

The Catholic bishops vindicated Athanasius and wrote to the Pope,[30] who, " though separated in body was present in mind and agreement and will," and whose " excuse for absence was good and unavoidable. . . ." " For this will seem to be most good and very proper, if to the head, that is to the See of Peter the Apostle, the Bishops of the Lord shall refer from all provinces." Julius had already shown by his dealings with Athanasius that he held that a pope could summon a patriarch to Rome, could annul the decisions of a council, could command a council to be held, and could restore deposed bishops to their sees.

The Fathers of Sardica likewise were determined to show against the Arians that the pope had power to restore those whom their synods had condemned and to affirm and establish the principle of appeals to the pope.

So long as the two chief sees of the East, Alexandria and Antioch, were in the possession of Arians, as they now were, and while so many of the Eastern bishops acted like puppets at the dictation of the court, an orthodox bishop could expect little justice.[31]

The council has an importance all its own because of its famous Canons III, IV and V. It does not concern us now that the canons were apparently of little practical use or that

[29] *Athan. Apol.*, 36.

[30] See S. Hilary's *Fragments*.

[31] cf. Chapman, *Bp. G. and Cath. Claims*, and Batiffol, *Les Recours à Rome en Orient,"* p. 15.

the powers which they assert were rarely if ever exercised.[32] It is the claims themselves which are made and assented to which interest us. In Canon III this new machinery is spoken of as "*in honour of the Apostle Peter.*" There is nothing, be it noted, about the legislation being due to Rome as the capital.

Canon III.

The bishop Hosius said: "If a bishop shall have been condemned (i.e. deposed, as appears from the Canon IV)[33] and considers he has right on his side, so that a fresh sentence ought to be pronounced, let us honour, if it pleases you, the memory of the Apostle Peter; let those who have examined the case, or those who dwell in the neighbouring province, write to (Julius) the Bishop of Rome, and he will furnish arbitrators. But if he cannot prove that his cause has need of a second judgment, let the first stand as valid."[34]

Canon IV.

The Bishop Gaudentius said: "It is necessary, if it please you, to add to the decree full of charity which you have carried; if a bishop deposed by the judgment of the bishops of his region demand for himself a new trial, let no successor be given to him before the Bishop of Rome, having decided the affair, has pronounced judgment."

Canon V.

Bishop Hosius said: "It has pleased us to add: if a bishop accused and deposed by the bishops of his district, in order to appeal about it takes refuge with the blessed Bishop of the Roman Church to submit the matter to his decision, let the latter, if it seem right to him, proceed to a new examination of the case, let him be willing to write to the nearest bishops of his province to examine everything with care and exactitude and to decide according to the truth."[35]

[32] cf. C. H. Turner, in *Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. iii, 1902, p. 292. Art., "The Genuineness of the Sardican Canons." "He who claimed the succession to the keys of the Kingdom direct from Christ through Peter might hesitate to appeal in so many words to the sanction of Sardica, however gladly he availed himself in practice of the privileges accorded by that synod to his see. It was not till the name of Sardica was merged in that of Nicæa that the Roman bishops could afford without derogation to their claims, to shelter themselves under the authority of a council."

[33] See Hefele, ii, p. 114.

[34] See Photius, *Syntagma Canonum*. *P. G.*, civ, 472.

[35] "But if he who asked that his case be re-heard shall move by his entreaty the Bishop of Rome to send his presbyters *ex latere*, it shall be in the power of the said Bishop (of Rome) to exercise his discretion, and if he shall judge that they (the legates) shall be sent invested with his authority, let it be as he shall determine. But if, on the other hand, he (the

But these Sardican canons have been a considerable bone of contention among historical critics. Their genuineness has been denied.

When Pope Zosimus (418) grounds his right of interference in the affairs of the African Church on canons, the existence of which was apparently unknown to the Africans, the ignorance at first sight is somewhat remarkable, in view of the almost contemporary reference to them by Bishop Gratus at his Council of Carthage (348).[36] The canons which Zosimus quoted as Nicene were not known as such to the Eastern Churches. They were those of the Council of Sardica (343), the council at which the re-instatement of Athanasius and other Nicene prelates was ordered.

Still, whether one subscribes to the arguments of Dr. Friedrich that these canons are a forgery, or agrees with the cogent and convincing arguments of Prof. C. H. Turner that they are genuine, the point for us now is this : that although it cannot be said that the assumptions implied or the functions assigned in these canons to the See of Rome and the papacy are either equivocal or doubtful, *these canons are still found in all Eastern collections of canons. Photius evidently thought the Sardican canons genuine, for he included them among his documents.*[37]

Pope Julius died in 352, and was succeeded by Liberius.

The much-controverted history of *Pope Liberius* has to be reviewed with reference to Eastern relations with Rome. A calm and impartial consideration of the case of Liberius has often been made impossible by the influence of the popular or prejudiced assertion that he condemned S. Athanasius as a heretic, and that he signed a heretical Creed.[38] Prof. Glubokovsky, e.g. still maintains the latter : " Liberius signed the semi-Arian Creed."[39]

Constantius, now sole emperor, favoured the Arians, though himself a semi-Arian, and worked with might and main to rid himself of Athanasius and his teaching.

Pope) is of opinion that the bishops (of the province) are not sufficient to settle the matter, let him (the Pope) act as he shall determine according to his own most wise judgment."

[36] " If the African *corpus juris* embedded in the acts of the Carthaginian Council of 419 omits entirely the African synod under Gratus, it is small wonder that Augustine and other African Churchmen should have been equally ignorant of the Synod of Sardica."—C. H. Turner, *Journal of Theological Studies*, p. 391, vol. iii.

[37] *P. G.*, clv., 472. *Syntagma Canonum* 1. Photius, however, maintained that no one in the East knew of the Canons of Sardica. See Gasquet, p. 218. *Op. cit.*

[38] Dr. Littledale's *Plain Reasons against joining the Church of Rome*, for example.

[39] *The Christian East* (December, 1924), p. 167.

In 353 he summoned a synod to meet at Arles. Synods and Creeds were the obsession of the day. The pagan Ammianus Marcellinus waxes sarcastic over the penchant of Constantius for them. Twelve different creeds: five of Antioch, four of Sirmium, one of Constantinople, one of Acacius of Cyzicus, beside the Nicene Creed—claimed adherence. The Creed of Nicæa was the one that could not be tolerated; the rest, representing various degrees of Arianism and semi-Arianism, had a wide field for competition.

The great curse of the East we see again is Cæsaro-papism, for the career of Constantius affords a special instance of it as a consistent policy. Mgr. Batiffol, indeed, speaking of the conversion of Constantine, his father, says of him: "*Le prince, en qualité de* Pontifex Maximus, *avait été le tuteur des dieux et le grand maître des sacerdoces officiels; le catholicisme ne lui laissa le rôle que de donateur et de protecteur, et entendait maintenir intégralement son autonomie intérieure. Constantin accepta cette conception des rapports de l'Etat et de l'Eglise. Le fait qu'il l'ait acceptée est bien la preuve décisive qu'il était converti. Ce fut la grande victoire du catholicisme, au moment de la paix constantinienne, de ne pas se jeter dans les bras du prince chrétien, de lui imposer au contraire l'indépendance du domaine ecclésiastique dans le domaine de l'ordre public, et de n'accepter du prince que ses services.*"[40]

But Batiffol goes too far in his estimate of the self-restricted position taken by Constantine. The Emperor was by no means content to play such a subordinate part. Enough instances to the contrary have already been adduced to show this.

His son Constantius, a contemptible and somewhat ridiculous person, was not slow to follow the precedent which his father had set, and speedily to develop, exaggerate, and distort it. It is strange to find Gregory Nazianzen loading Constantius with encomiums, contrasting his virtues with the vices of his rather pathetic successor, Julian,[41] this Emperor Constantius who dishonoured himself "by starting the first persecution of Christian by Christian that the world had seen."[42] But this may be said in extenuation—Constantius, like his father, was not baptised till his death-bed.[43]

Constantius speedily showed that he was by no means satis-

[40] *La Paix Constantinienne*, pp. 525–6.
[41] cf. Gasquet, *Op. cit.* p. 77. Gregory of Nazianzen, *Invectiva prior.*
[42] C. Oman, *Byzantine Empire*, p. 31. Maycock, *Op. cit.* p. 25.
[43] Athan. *De. Synod*, 31.

fied to fulfil a rôle of subordination. Athanasius was constantly protesting against his unlawful interference in the affairs of the Church. He imagines Constantius saying :

" Whatever I will, be that esteemed a canon"
Ἀλλ ὅπερ ἐγὼ βούλομαι τοῦτο κανὼν ἔλεγε νομιζέσθω.[44]

He even sees in Constantius an Antichrist :

" It is the part of true godliness not to compel, but to persuade, as I said before. Thus our Lord Himself, not as employing force, but as offering to their free choice, has said to all, ' If any man will follow after Me ' ; and to His disciples, ' Will ye also go away ?'

" This heresy, however, is altogether alien from godliness ; and therefore how otherwise should it act than contrary to our Saviour, seeing also that it has enlisted that enemy of Christ, Constantius, as it were Antichrist himself, to be its leader in impiety ?"[45]

Athanasius more than once recurs to the resemblance to Antichrist. Here is another instance :

" Now what is yet wanting to make him Antichrist ? Or what more could Antichrist do at his coming than this man has done ? Will he not find when he comes that the way has been already prepared for him by this man easily to deceive the people ? Again, he claims to himself the right of deciding causes, which he refers to the Court instead of the Church, and presides at them in person."[46]

And yet once more :

" Terrible indeed, and worse than terrible, are such proceedings ; and yet is this conduct suitable to him who represents the character of Antichrist. Who that beheld him bearing sway over his pretended bishops, and presiding in ecclesiastical causes, would not justly exclaim that this was the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel ? For having put on the profession of Christianity and entering into the holy places, and standing therein, he lays waste the Churches, transgressing their canons, and enforcing the observance of his own decrees."[47]

What Athanasius thought of Pope Liberius and his position in the Church he clearly shows :

[44] *Hist. Arian*, 33.
[45] *Ibid*, 67.
[46] *Ibid*, 76.
[47] *Ibid.*, 77.

"They spared not even Liberius, Bishop of Rome . . . they respected not his bishopric, because it was an apostolical throne, they felt no reverence for Rome, because she is the metropolis of Romania[48] (μητρόπολις ἡ Ῥώμη τῆς Ῥωμανίας ἐστίν). They remembered not that formerly in their letters they had spoken of her bishops as apostolical men. When they perceived that he was an orthodox man (ὀρθοδοξοῦντα), and hated the Arian heresy, and earnestly endeavoured to persuade all persons to renounce and withdraw from it, these impious men reasoned thus with themselves, *'If we can persuade Liberius, we shall soon prevail over all.'*"[49]

Athanasius contrasts the servility and acquiescence of the Eastern prelates with the placid dignity of the handful of bishops from Gaul and Italy at Milan, when we might say the orders of the emperor amounted to "either sign or resign":

"When the Bishops heard this they were utterly amazed, and stretching forth their hands to God, they used great boldness of speech against him, teaching him that the Kingdom (βασιλείαν) was not his, but God's, who had given it to him, whom also they bid him fear, lest He should suddenly take it away from him. And they threatened him with the day of judgment, and warned him against infringing ecclesiastical order (μή διαφθείρειν τὰ ἐκκλησιαστικά), and *mingling Roman sovereignty with the constitution of the Church* (μηδὲ ἐγκαταμίσγειν τὴν ῥωμαϊκὴν ἀρχὴν τῇ τῆς ἐκκλησίας διαταγῇ) nor to introduce the Arian heresy into the Church of God."[50]

If Liberius did fall, if he did sign a semi-Arian Creed, it was under utter compulsion. What value has the signature of a man at whose head a pistol is held? The words of Newman may be usefully recalled here: "It is astonishing to me how anyone can fancy that Liberius in subscribing the Arian confession promulgated it *ex cathedra*, considering he was not his own master when he signed, and it was not his drawing up. Who would say that it would be a judgment of the Queen's Bench, or a judicial act of any kind, if ribbon-men in Ireland seized one of Her Majesty's judges, hurried him into the wilds of Connemara, and there made him, under terror of his life, sign a document in the very teeth of an award which he had lately made in court on a question of property?"[51]

[48] Romania = the Roman Empire, *so.* Montfaucon, after Nannius.
[49] *Hist. Arian*, 35. [50] *Ibid.*, 34.
[51] Newman, *Historical Sketches*, ii, p. 340.

Mention was made above of the assertion so often made, that Liberius anathematised Athanasius as a heretic. This is simply perverse. It need not be considered. But concerning the signing of the Creed there has been considerable controversy, though I do not myself believe he ever signed a heretical creed. And for this reason, that had he done so, no event of the dispute would have been better known. The Emperor would have trumpeted it far and wide. Besides, Liberius would hardly have had the audacity to deal so firmly and drastically, after the Council of Ariminum, with bishops who had been beguiled into heresy, if he had been known himself to have fallen before, or at any rate until he had publicly confessed his own lapse. And what record is there of anything like it ? He annulled the council, he deposed the bishops who had fallen, and only restored them if they accepted the Council of Nicæa.[52]

Mgr. Batiffol, in the preface to his book, *La Paix Constantinienne*, truly remarks that the recent works of such scholars as Duchesne, Dom Chapman, etc., render it unnecessary for him to enter upon the question of Liberius at any length. "*Je suis persuadé que tout était dit, et que je n'avais plus qu'à exprimer mon vote en le motivant. Libère m'est apparu comme un pape aussi incapable que saint Hilaire d'avoir trahi le Nicaenum, aimé de ses fidèles Romains comme saint Athanase l'était de sa fidèle Egypte, calomnié par Germinius et sa clique qui était capable de tout, même de fabriquer de fausses lettres, et d'en imposer â saint Jerôme ! La 'chute' du pape Libère est moins vraisemblable que la malhonnêteté de Germinius, d'Ursace, de Valens.*"

Sozomen,[53] however, certainly states that Liberius signed a heretical creed, and apparently Hilary believed it, and Jerome also, deceived by the Arians. Fortunatian of Aquileia showed a doubtful epistle, in which Liberius agreed to the deposition of Athanasius.

There were three creeds of Sirmium clamouring for Liberius' signature. One the Emperor could never have required him to sign, for it was Arian, and the Emperor was semi-Arian, and had ordered all copies of it to be destroyed. The other two were patient of an orthodox interpretation, so that if he signed at all, he signed one of them. And if, as the epistle preserved among the works of Hilary says, he signed in exile the first formulary, he added a saving clause in which he excommuni-

[52] cf. A. L. Maycock, *The Papacy*, p. 26. "It seems certain that nobody in Rome knew anything about the affair during Liberius' lifetime, nor did the Pope himself ever make any reference to it. But his later years in the papal office showed him as staunch as before his exile."

[53] *H. E.* iv, 15. See also Largent, *Saint Hilaire*, p. 84.

cated anyone who refused to confess that the Father and the Son resemble each other in all, even in Their Essence.[54]

Liberius was welcomed back to Rome from his exile in Thrace, in spite of there being an anti-pope or *locum tenens* (Felix) in possession. The Constantinopolitan historian Sozomen writes :

> "The bishops who were then convened at Sirmium wrote to Felix, who governed the Roman Church, and to the other bishops, desiring them to receive Liberius. They directed that both should share the apostolical throne and discharge the priestly duties in common, with harmony of mind ; and that whatever illegalities might have occurred in the ordination of Felix or the banishment of Liberius might be buried in oblivion."

Of Pope Liberius, Sozomen goes on to speak in the highest terms :

> " The people of Rome regarded Liberius as a very excellent man, and esteemed him highly on account of the courage he had evinced in opposing the emperor, so that they had even excited seditions on his account, and had gone so far as to shed blood. Felix survived but a short time ; and Liberius found himself in sole possession of the Church. This event was, no doubt, ordained by God, that the *See of Peter* might not be dishonoured by the occupancy of two bishops ; for such an arrangement is a sign of discord, and is foreign to ecclesiastical law."[55]

One has to bear in mind, as Tixeront reminds us, that the reputation of Liberius does not appear to have suffered from this incident in the " *milieu romain.*"[56]

What the Latins thought of Liberius is shown by such ascriptions as these :

St. Ambrose, writing to his sister Marcella (377) says :

> " *Beatæ memoriæ Liberii præcepta revolve ut, quo vir sanctior, eo sermo accedat gratior.*"[57]

and Pope Siricius (384-398)

> " *Post cassatum Arimin. concilium, missa ad provincias a. ven. mem. prædecessore meo Liberio generalia decreta.*"[58]

[54] Funk, *Op. cit.*, i, 140.

[55] Sozomen, *H. E.*, iv, 15.

[56] Tixeront, *Histoire des Dogmes*, ii, p. 53 note, where he refers to the letter of Anastasius to Venerius of Milan (*c.* 400) (see J. van den Ghein in *Revue d'Histoire et de littérature religieuse* (1899), pp. 1-12), and he says : " *L'auteur, qui avait du connaître personnellement Libère, le compare à Eusèbe de Verceil et à Hilaire, et ne suppose qu'il ait jamais failli.*"

[57] *P. L.*, xvi, 219.

[58] Denziger, 88. cf. *S. Anastasius ibid.*, p. 93.

While Sozomen records that Liberius perpetually adhered to the faith of the Nicene Council, even if before his ordination he had been too charitably tolerant of the communion of the heterodox.

De Rossi has discovered the epitaph of Liberius :

" Electus fidei plenus summusque sacerdos,
Qui nivea mente immaculatus Papa sederes,
Qui bene apostolicam doctrinam sancte doceres . . . .
In synodo, cunctis superatis victor iniquis
Sacrilegis, Nicæna fides electa triumphat.
Contra quamplures certamen sumpseris unus
Catholica præcincte fide, possederis omnes,
Vox tua certantis fuit haec, sincera, salubris . . .
Haec fuit, haec semper mentis constantia firma,
Discerptus, tractus . . . .
Insuper . . . . nobili falsa manu portantes."[59]

But what is *ad rem* in our discussion is the question : What did the East think of Liberius ? For answer one looks again at the liturgical books in use to-day. This procedure does not, however, commend itself to Professor Glubokovsky who writes : " We are referred, especially by the Russian renegades of the Jesuit Order, to the wording of certain liturgical documents. Our answer is, Yes we do use them, but we understand them in a sense entirely different from that ascribed them by the Papists. It is hardly necessary to add that one must not forget the elementary scientific axiom, that every literary document must be interpreted in the spirit of its author and those who faithfully apply it."[60] This explanation, if such it can be called, is worth recording here, though, indeed, it will be even more usefully recalled when we come to the far stronger Eastern eulogies of Pope Leo and Pope Gregory and Pope Martin, for example. However, it is difficult to me to understand how the Easterns can thus laud Pope Liberius (who, Prof. Glubokovsky is certain, " signed the semi-Arian Creed ")[61]—if he did sign a heretical creed. For to-day they venerate

" Our holy father Liberius, Roman bishop, Confessor, who lived in the time of the Emperor Constantius, and receiving

[59] De Rossi, *Inscr.*, ii, 85. It should be mentioned that there are critics who do not follow De Rossi in attributing the epitaph to Liberius, though Duchesne agrees with him. Funk says it belongs to Pope Martin I. And there is a difficulty in referring it to Liberius unless the words " a martyr in exile " are rendered " a martyr *by* exile." (See Chapman in *Cath. Encyc.* Art. " Liberius.")

[60] Art. " Papal Rome and Orthodox East," in *The Christian East*, Nov., 1923. cf. d'Herbigny, *L'Unité dans le Christ*, pp. 19–20.

[61] *Christian East* (1924), p. 167.

the great Athanasius and Paul the confessor at Rome, restored to each their own sees. Wherefore Constantius . . . . drove him from Rome, and strove to persuade him not to communicate with Athanasius; and to support his own heresy, banished him to Thrace. . . Whence he returned to his own see . . . . and after a good life fell asleep in the Lord."[62]

[62] *Synax. Const.* 27 Aug., p. 828, ed. Delehaye. cf. Maltzew, *Menologion*, ii, 791, for use in Russia to-day.

CHAPTER VII

THE MELETIAN SCHISM—S. BASIL AND S. JOHN CHRYSOSTOM

We must now retrace our steps somewhat. The "unprincipled ambition"[1] of Eusebius of Nicomedia inspired him to turn his activities towards Antioch and against Eustathius, its bishop of unblemished orthodoxy.

It was a craftily planned campaign that the Arians waged against the bishop with ridiculous charges of Sabellianism, immoral conduct, and want of respect to Helena, the Emperor's mother.[2] Their schemes, helped unfortunately by the other Eusebius, the historian-bishop of Cæsarea, were successful. Constantine was influenced as they desired; and Eustathius was deposed (330) as being a centre of general turbulence and unrest, and sent into exile, first to Thrace and then to Macedonia. In truth his banishment was due solely to his orthodoxy and to the unceasing scheming of the Eusebians.

Probably the reason why he did not appeal to the pope,[3] as Athanasius, Marcellus, Theodore, Ignatius and the rest in like cases did, was that death speedily overtook him. After his deposition he passes into oblivion and disappears from history, for when, after the death of Constantine (337), exiled bishops are recalled, the name of Eustathius is not found in the list of those who return. And this brings us to the Meletian schism, a complex question, which is well described by a present-day writer as one of the most thorny in the Church history of the fourth century, but which, though it means a certain amount of digression, has factors of importance in our present investigation.

Briefly, the origin of the schism may be stated thus:

[1] Newman's *Arians of the Fourth Century*, p. 26. Eusebius had the joy of the consummation of his ambition in being translated (339), in spite of Canons xv and xvi of Nicæa, to Constantinople. He died 341. See also Chapman, Art. cit. *Downside Review* (August, 1925), p. 95.

[2] *Athan. Arian*, iv. *P. G.*, xxv, 697.

[3] But see Chapman, Art. cit. p. 108.

The Arians set up Eudoxius to replace Eustathius.

The Catholics for the most part accepted him.

But a few still clung to Eustathius and formed a Eustathian party.

Eudoxius dies and the Arians appoint Meletius bishop of Sebaste in Armenia to succeed him.

To their surprise, disappointment and disgust, though consecrated by the Arians he proves to be a Catholic "Nicene." In less than a month they have trumped up the usual charges, got rid of him, and have put Euzoius in his place.

So there are three parties: the Eustathians and Meletians, both Catholic, and the supporters of Euzoius, Arian. But things became more complicated still, when now Lucifer of Cagliari comes, and, though he has no commission or jurisdiction in Syria, consecrates Paulinus as successor of Eustathius. One understands this step, though one finds difficulty in excusing it. The consecration of Paulinus was a huge misfortune, for it perpetuated the schism and gave it official countenance. F. Cavallera does right to say that Meletius and his flock must be put outside the question; they did their duty, and it is absurd to call by the name of "Meletian" schism an intrigue in which the Paulinians, their adversaries, played the principal rôle. The election of Paulinus was made in violation of canonical rules known everywhere, and if the awkwardness of the Meletians provoked later the recognition by Egypt and the West of a *fait accompli*, one can only blame the primary act.[4]

All the same, since Eustathius was confessedly the legitimate bishop, the attitude of the Eustathian party to their exiled bishop cannot be said to be wrong. The trouble arose when Lucifer consecrated Paulinus.

It is a tangle, and it is possible to condemn the delay and hesitancy of Rome, but it is difficult to see what else she could do. It is, however, a Roman Catholic writer who says, *a propos* of this schism at Antioch specially: "We must confess that Rome had sometimes given these Eastern Christians cause for discontent. Of course, nothing can justify schism; they had so often protested that at Rome still stood the Rock on which Christ had built his Church, they had so often acknowledged the pope's right as supreme judge. Still, the most rightful judges have made mistakes; if we look for the cause of anger against Rome which made the schism possible we shall have to

[4] See Cavallera, *Op. cit.*, p. 115. F. Cavallera's sympathies are with Meletius. cf. Appendix VIII.

put, at any rate, some of it down to the account of Rome itself."[5]

But then this was hardly a schism *from* Rome. *For Meletius himself always claimed to be in communion with Rome.* Meletius and Paulinus each looked upon the other as the intruder. The affair, painful as it is, *does not tell against the primacy of Rome but for it.* All the personages concerned were anxious to get the approval of Damasus. What is all the history of the schism but the history of the efforts of the Paulinians and the Meletians—either party—to obtain, to the exclusion of their adversaries, the Roman recognition?[6] And Rome never declared that Meletius was cut off from the Church, for she knew that he was a Catholic.[7] What she did do was because of influences which were brought to bear on her—Athanasius and Peter of Alexandria, and Alexandria withheld recognition from Meletius and accorded it to Paulinus. And Basil and the East generally, which supported Meletius, were certainly never out of communion with Rome.

What made Basil so angry and so vehement was that the pope was misinformed and misled, and acted accordingly.

Rome, indeed, supported Lucifer's action, i.e. acknowledged the " Eustathian " succession, while the East as a whole supported Meletius.

When Meletius died Flavian succeeded him, and Paulinus was followed by Evagrius. The double line of bishops continued eighty-five years after Meletius' death, when the survivor was acknowledged by all as legitimate bishop.

It was the exile of Meletius really which marked the critical point of the controversy, for the two Catholic parties, the Eustathians and Meletians, hardened towards one another, and definite schism ensued when the Eustathians refused[8] the proposals of the Meletians to form a single Church. They were influenced by the fact that Meletius, although himself a Catholic, had received consecration from partly-Arian sources.

In Antioch the Arians took possession of all the churches, and the Catholics of both parties had to content themselves with meetings in houses.

Athanasius, who had always been in communion with the

[5] A. Fortescue, *The Orthodox Eastern Church*, p. 90.

[6] Grumel, *Echos d'Orient* (1922), p. 291.

[7] S. Meletius is commemorated in the Roman Church on February 12. The Greek Church likewise makes mention of him on Feb. 12, and on the 23rd and 24th August. See Nilles, *Kalendarium*, i, 90, and Delehaye, *Synax*, pp. 459, 917, 920.

[8] Theodoret, *H. E.*, iii, 2.

Eustathian community, though he had not yet recognised the succession of Paulinus, warmly desired the communion of Meletius. For some reason or other the latter delayed taking steps to communion, and in the meantime Paulinus, having accepted Athanasius' Council of Alexandria, was recognised by Athanasius as the bishop. Wherever in this controversy of Antioch one's sympathies may lie, the conclusion that the latest authority on the subject comes to is fully justified. "*Le conflit créé par le Schisme d'Antioche resta en realité* purement disciplinaire.

"*Quelque idée que l'on se fasse de son importance dans l'histoire des relations entre l'Orient et l'Occident*, ce serait singulièrement le méconnaître que d'y voir, comme on l'a fait quelquefois, le prélude du schisme photien."[9] But the significance and importance of the controversy are not slight. Great Eastern Fathers were concerned in it—Athanasius, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen; questions of imperial policy were mixed up in it; and for a time it may be said to have been the pivot of relations between the Catholics of East and West.

Had the schism arisen in any other place it would not have attracted so very much notice, but the importance lay in the fact of Antioch being the capital of Syria and the third of the "patriarchal" sees. And while Alexandria and Athanasius were the bulwark against Arianism protected by the imperial power,[10] Antioch was the citadel of anti-Nicæanism: and Antioch was now full of intellectual activity while Alexandria was somewhat on the decline.

S. Basil, the ardent and loyal supporter of Meletius, used his good offices with good effect with Athanasius. But the death of Athanasius soon after put an end to any negotiations for the peace of the Church in Antioch. Peter, who succeeded Athanasius, was an uncompromising opponent of Meletius, whom he looked upon as a heretic.

S. Basil, Bishop of Cæsarea, an apostolic see,[11] the greatest of the Cappadocian Fathers, was, like Gregory Nazianzen, Gregory of Nyssa, and Chrysostom, not baptised till adult years. It was

[9] F. Cavallera, *Le Schisme d'Antioche*, p. 322 (1905).

[10] As one studies this schism, one sees perpetually complications caused by the intrusion of the imperial power into the ecclesiastical domain. From Constantine's time, the East increasingly, without mistrust and gladly, welcomes the supremacy of the secular powers. But this intrusion cuts both ways: if in some directions it aids the Church, in others it hinders and weakens her. The same Constantine who banished the heretic Arius (325) banished his Catholic opponent Eustathius of Antioch five years later (330).

[11] Acts ii, 9; 1 Pet. i, 1.

in 357, at the age of twenty-seven, that he received baptism at the hands of Dianeios, Bishop of Cæsarea. Dianeios, as Batiffol reminds one, in his article " L'Ecclésiologie de Saint Basile "[12] had had a career somewhat unsympathetic towards Rome and the West. He signed the haughty address from the Council of Antioch to Pope Julius, supported Gregory of Cappadocia against Athanasius, and signed the manifesto *in encaeniis*. At Sardica he sided with the Easterns against Pope Julius, and signed the Arian formula at Ariminum which Constantius had forced on the bishops. Batiffol says, " *Dianeios est arien malgré lui*."

Besides being baptized by Dianeios Basil had been ordained reader by him, and always professed the greatest veneration for him.[13] Dianeios' signing of the Arian formula compelled Basil to renounce communion with him, but before he died Dianeios, who pleaded " simplicity of heart " and unwavering attachment to the Faith of " the 318 holy bishops " (Nicæa), was reconciled and in communion with Basil. It was from the next bishop, Eusebius, that Basil received the diaconate and the priesthood.

There is, as a matter of fact, little in actual words in the writings of S. Basil relating to the authority of the Apostolic See. And the part taken by the great Bishop of Cæsarea in the Meletian question still to-day gives rise to a considerable amount of discussion. The Pope, Damasus, was influenced by the information of affairs at Antioch which he got from Alexandrian sources. This was how he came to recognize Paulinus.

S. Basil was very much perturbed and gave expression to his feelings in strong terms.

But there is no contesting of the primacy of Rome. His complaint is that the West has not functioned as it ought, owing to its being wrongly informed.

Basil writes to his friend Eusebius of Samosata, and he is very sore and annoyed at the pride of the Westerns. After quoting Homer, he says :

> " Proud characters, when they are honoured, generally become only more disdainful. If God becomes propitious, what have we need of more ? If His anger continues to burst on us, of what assistance will Western pride be to us ? . . I would wish to write to their coryphæus outside the ordinary form and only to speak of ecclesiastical affairs in so far as it is

[12] *Echos d'Orient*, 1922, pp. 9–10.
[13] *De Spir. Sanct.*, 71.

necessary to insinuate that they do not know the truth of what is happening here and refuse to take the road by which they might come to know it, and that in general it is not necessary to affront those who have been tried by temptation, nor to take for dignity pride, a sin capable in itself of making us enemies of God."[14]

Mgr. Batiffol, in an article already referred to,[15] agrees with an earlier writer, Fialon,[16] in refusing to see any recognition of Roman primacy in the efforts taken by Basil towards peace in the schism of Antioch. They only see a demand for help. The pope, according to their reading of the situation, is invited to try where others have unfortunately failed.[17]

But though there is indeed little in the actual writings of S. Basil which emphasises the authority of the Roman see, there are these negotiations, and they presuppose certain principles. Sometimes " actions speak louder than words."

I think that on the whole a much more reasonable deduction is drawn from the history of the schism by another French writer, who says :

" De Saint Basile nous n'avons rien en paroles qui relève l'autorité du Siège apostolique, mais nous avons des démarches, et il nous signale les faits. Ces démarches et ces faits nous prouvent l'impuissance de l'Orient à se suffire en matière de foi, la nécessité d'un accord avec l'Occident, accord à effectuer sur l'autorité de Rome, la prépondérance et la primauté de Rome dans l'enseignment de la foi, son autorité effective jusque dans les régions les plus éloignées de l'Orient, la necessité de son intervention pour guérir les grands maux de l'Eglise. De tout cela, saint Basile ne s'est pas fait encore une fois le docteur formel, mais il en reste du moins le témoin et l'attestateur très précieux, comme le montrent très nettement les rapports que les circonstances ont rendus nécessaires entre lui et le Siège Apostolique."[18]

. . . . .

[14] *P. G.*, xxxii, 893. *Ep.* 239. But cf. *Ep.* 69 and 265.

[15] *L'Ecclésiologie de S. Basile.*

[16] *Etude littéraire sur Saint Basile*, Paris. 1869.

[17] Cardinal Marini (Appendix, *Il Primato*, p. 357, " Apologia di S. Basilio il Grande per la sua condotta verso i Romani Pontifici ") protests that these writers are too absolute and unbalanced in their assertions, and that they would have done better for their case to have shaded off their thought somewhat. cf. Paul Allard, *S. Basile*, chap. vi. " Les Rapports avec l'Occident," and V. Grumel, " Saint Basile et le Siège Apostolique," in *Echos d'Orient*, 1922.

[18] V. Grumel, Art. " Saint Basile et le Siège Apostolique," in *Echos d'Orient*, No. 127 (1922), p. 292. cf. *Ep.* 69, " We thought it expedient to

Another great Father is intimately concerned in the Meletian schism. John Chrysostom, born at Antioch, owed very much to Meletius; in fact, he was baptised by him (*c.* 369) at the age of twenty-five. Chrysostom had followed the extraordinary custom—against which he later, as other Fathers in like case, vigorously protested—of deferring baptism till adult years. S. John Chrysostom, like S. Basil, was a devoted adherent of Meletius, who, according to the testimony of sympathisers of even the other Catholic party, e.g. Jerome and Epiphanius, was a man of great holiness, personal charm, and popularity. Meletius also ordained John "reader" (ἀναγνωστὴς), and in 381 deacon, while Flavian, Meletius' successor, raised him to the priesthood in 386.

Though Meletius died in communion with Rome and is one of her canonised saints, the rival lines of bishops (as we have seen) continued for eighty-five years after his death, and when the Eustathian line came to an end, it was by the efforts of S. John Chrysostom that Flavian the bishop of the Meletian succession was recognised by the pope (Siricius) as the lawful bishop.

In view of this connection, so intimate, with Meletius, and also of the great position which this wonderful orator filled as Patriarch of Constantinople, it is of peculiar value to estimate what Chrysostom thought of Petrine prerogatives and claims.

It is astonishing how Bishop Gore can deliver himself of such a statement as the following: "I believe, indeed, that none of the Greek Fathers of the first six centuries connects the position of the bishop of Rome with S. Peter."[19] Is it that the bishop would acknowledge all that S. Chrysostom claims for S. Peter personally? Evidently not (see p. 6). Still less if he acknowledged it of S. Peter would he allow it of Peter's successors. Chrysostom's writings simply abound in passages—there are nearly a hundred of them—dealing with Peter, his name and

write to the Bishop of Rome that he should examine our affairs and to advise him, since it would be difficult to send anyone thence by the common decree of a council to use his lawful authority in the matter, choosing men fit to bear the fatigue of a journey and also fit to correct all perverse people in our parts, firmly but gently."

To Pope Damasus, Basil wrote to acquaint him with the state of the East during the persecution of Valens: "The only remedy which we see for these evils is a visitation from Your Mercy" (*Ep.* 70) [and see *Prolegomena in S. Dam.*, 1 ap., *P. L.* xiii]. "Send us men who share our faith. They will settle quarrels, they will bring unison to the Churches of God; at least they will make known to you the authors of the troubles, so that you will know whom to admit to your communion."—Ep. 70, *P. G.*, xxxii, 435.

[19] *Roman Catholic Claims*, p. 91.

his office. It is the mere controversialist who tries to explain them away—but without success. Those passages which will be adduced have a meaning neither ambiguous nor equivocal.[20] They make this extraordinary assertion of Dr. Gore's, to me, more puzzling still.

To take but a few passages from the many of this Patriarch of Constantinople relative to S. Peter :

(1) *S. Peter's life and death at Rome.*

It used to be the fashion, or duty—as Lanciani observed[21]—to cast doubts on the presence of Peter in Rome. The Tübingen school with their absurd theories have supplied much controversial ammunition to modern Eastern opponents of the papacy. But their Father Chrysostom's evidence should be of more weight with Easterns than modern German speculation.

In the Second Homily on the Epistle to the Romans Chrysostom says :

> Your faith, said Paul to the Romans, is known in all the world . . . and indeed *Peter had preached there.*[22]

In the last Homily on the Epistle to the Romans there is a magnificent passage in which he says that while he might praise Rome because of her greatness, antiquity, beauty, population, power, riches, victories, these are not the things which have any weight with him. Greater than all this is to have had a letter from Paul. In all his writings one finds a great devotion to S. Paul, " whose heart was the heart of Christ."

> " This is what raises this city above all others. Like an immense giant this city has two sparkling eyes which are the bodies of the saints (*sc.* Peter and Paul) . . . From there Paul will be raised, thence Peter will rise. . . The body of Paul is for this city a rampart more secure than all the towers and fortifications, the *Body of Peter too.*"

During his life Peter received marks of honour from Paul :

> " I went up to Jerusalem said the latter to make the

[20] Since this section was written, I have come across the recent work of Cardinal Marini, *Il primato di S. Pietro e de suoi Successori* (Rome, 1922), which exhaustively deals with the question of Chrysostom and the Roman primacy. Granted that some of the Cardinal's conclusions could not be accepted—he certainly makes the most of his material—his main contentions are incontestable. Dom J. Chapman in the *Dublin Review*, 1903, pp. 1–27, devoted a learned article to the same subject, " Saint Chrysostom on S. Peter."

[21] See Appendix IV.

[22] *P. G.*, lx, 402. *Epist. ad Rom.*, ii, 1.

acquaintance of Peter. That is why, when Peter died, grace Divine willed to make him the companion of Paul."[23]

(2) *Chrysostom shows that Peter received a primacy, not simply of honour, but of jurisdiction.*

The Metropolitan Anthony of Kiev delivered a lecture in Belgrad (1923) on the Orthodox Church and the papacy.[24] As he presides under the Patriarch Tikhon's commission over all Russians outside Russia, his words have special weight. This is from his own summary :

" If the Roman Catholics should renounce their imaginings, then their restoration to union with the Church would be a matter for the greatest joy . . . . for the realisation of the restored fulness of the Church's life to which our brethren of the West would bring that corporate ecclesiastical activity which is characteristic of them. In the circumstances of the renunciation by the Roman Catholics of their pseudo-dogmas, and in particular of that absurd one of them which ascribes infallibility to the Pope in matters of Faith, the Holy Church, in restoring them to union with herself, *would not only certainly restore to the Roman Primate that primacy which was assigned to him* before his falling away into schism, *but would probably invest him with such an authority in the œcumenical Church as had never hitherto been assigned to him*—inasmuch as that which he formerly possessed was confined to Western Europe and North-West Africa. But such authority, assumed as being given to the Pope after his return to orthodoxy, would be based, not on *Roman fables about the Apostle Peter as chief over all the apostles*, about the succession of the popes to the fulness of his imaginary authority . . . . but in the practical need of ecclesiastical life by the force of which that life was gradually centralised ; first, in the metropolitanates (from the third century) and then in the patriarchates (from the fourth and fifth centuries), with the result that the authority of the metropolitans and patriarchs in their areas was continually strengthened in proportion to the assimilation of the people to Christian culture. We admit for the future the conception of a single personal supremacy of the Church in consonance with the broadest preservation of the conciliar principle and on the condition that that supremacy does not pretend to be based on such *invented traditions as the above*, but only on the practical need of ecclesiastical life."

[23] Hom., 32, in *Epist. ad Romanos*, 2, 4. *P. G.*, lx, 678, 680.
[24] *The Christian East*, p. 24, vol. v, 1924.

Turning now to S. Chrysostom, S. Matt. xvi, 18, we find these comments, which it would be hard, indeed, in my judgment, *impossible, to reconcile with the Metropolitan's confident assertions :*

" ' But you, whom do ye say that I am ?' What does Peter reply . . . . he the mouth of the apostles, he *the coryphæus of the choir of the apostles ?* All were asked, but it is he who begins speaking. ' And I say unto thee that thou art Peter and on this Rock I will build my Church,' that is to say, on the faith of thy confession. He shows him thereby that many will soon receive the faith ; he gives him the feeling of his dignity and *makes him Shepherd* . . . . ' And I will give thee,' as My Father has given it to you to know Me in the same way, I too, will give you . . . . What dost thou give him, I say ? ' The Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven.' Things which are proper to God alone (Ἃ τοῦ θεοῦ μόνου ἐστιν ἴδια) to forgive sins, to make the Church unmovable in the midst of so furious tempests, to give to a simple fisherman a force of resistance superior to that of a rock. . . . The Father speaking to Jeremiah, said to him, ' I will place thee as a column of brass and as a rampart ' but he was sent to one nation only ; *this one (Peter) is concerned with all the world.* (ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνον μὲν) ἑνὶ ἔθνει τοῦτον δὲ πανταχοῦ τῆς οἰκουμένης.)"[25]

It is " on the faith of his confession," but that is not separable from the person of Peter. He, too, is the Rock.

He speaks to the same effect in other passages, e.g.

" Jesus says 'Thou art Simon son of Jonas, thou shalt be called Cephas.' He does not say, ' I will call thee Peter and I will build My Church on this Rock,' but ' thou shalt be called Cephas.' The first manner of speaking indicates authority and power, but Christ does not expose at once from the beginning the extent of His power, for the moment he employs more human language. It was only when Peter had published his divinity that He said with sovereign authority, 'Blessed art thou Simon for My Father has revealed it to thee.' And again, 'And I say to thee that thou art Peter.' "[26]

Again he writes :

" He who built the Church upon the confession of Peter . . . Who *gave to this apostle the keys of heaven* and invested him with so great a power.[27]

[25] Hom. 54, *in Matt.* 1, 2. *P. G.*, lviii, 533.
[26] Hom. 19, *in Joan.* *P. G.*, lix, 122.
[27] Hom. 82, *in Matt.* *P. G.*, lviii, 741. τοσαύτης ἐξουσίας.

Again :

"'*Since Peter had the appearance of being the first among the disciples,*' it is to him that the tax-gatherers address themselves, he comments. Jesus replied to Peter 'Take this stater and give it to them for me and thee.' You see the exceeding greatness and honour which is done him. See also the self-command of Peter's mind.[28] For this point Mark, the follower of this apostle, doth not appear to have set down, because it indicated the great honour paid to him; but while of the denial he wrote as well as the rest, the things which make him illustrious he hath passed over in silence, his master perhaps entreating him not to mention the great things about himself. And he used the phrase 'for Me and thee' because Peter too was a firstborn child."

This passage is quite sufficient of itself to show that S. Peter stood, in Chrysostom's mind, quite by himself—that there were promises and privileges designed by Christ peculiar to Peter alone. Chrysostom remarks that they were not distressed when the three were specially honoured in the Transfiguration, but this was different, and they felt hurt when the honour was confined to one. But it is not an isolated incident. It was indeed to Peter that Jesus had said, "I will give thee the keys and Blessed art thou Son of Jonas."[29]

"Is it not because he was unmovable in his faith that Peter received this name?"[30]

"He received this surname of Peter because of the firmness and immutability of his faith, and when all were asked, he, outstripping the others, cried, 'Thou art the Christ the Son of the living God.' It was then that the keys of heaven were entrusted to him.[31]

"Peter, the *coryphæus* of the choir of apostles, the mouth of the disciples, the column of the Church, the support of the Faith, the foundation of the confession, *the Fisherman of the Universe,* who draws our race from the abyss of error to lead it to the skies."[32]

"Since they had thrown in prison Peter and John, the son of thunder and the *Foundation of the Faith.*"[33]

But as I have said above, the quotations could be multiplied.

[28] Hom. 58, *in Matt.*, 1, 2. *P. G.*, lviii, 566, 568.
[29] Hom. 58, *in Matt.*, 1, 2. *P. G.*, lviii, 568.
[30] Hom., *in faciem ei restiti.* *P. G.*, li, 375.
[31] *Ad Galatas, c.* 2. *P. G.*, lxi, 640.
[32] *P. G.*, li, 20. Hom., *de talentorum debitore.*
[33] *P. G.*, lxii, 499. Hom. 7, *in templo. S. Anastasiae.*

It is certainly difficult to find here the idea of "*primus inter pares*"—a primacy of honour merely. *Evidently Chrysostom believed "the Roman fables about the Apostle Peter as chief over all the apostles!" Plainly he fully accepted what the Metropolitan Anthony of Kiev terms 'invented traditions!'* In his comments on S. John xvi, "Simon son of Jonas, lovest thou Me, etc.," Chrysostom says :

> "the fault and his denial have been effaced. *He restores to him the government of his brothers*, and without saying a word about the denial, without reproving him with the past, only says to him, 'If thou lovest Me, be set over the brethren.'"[34]

Chrysostom dealing with the earlier incident in the Gospel history, when Peter had asked Christ, "Who, then, can be saved?" had commented thus on it :

> "He was not yet shepherd and he had already a soul of a shepherd. He had not yet received the authority (ἀρχή) and he would already show the solicitude which belongs to a ruler. *Already he had the care of the interests of all the world.*[35]

And so here, in this incident of the Risen Christ, Chrysostom says :

> "Peter had a great love for John, and since Jesus had just spoken of great things to him and had conferred on him the care of the world, he wished to have John as companion .... In replying to Peter : 'As for thee, do thou follow Me,' Jesus lets him hear afresh the care he has for him and the close intimacy with which He favours him. And if anyone were to ask me how it happens that it should be James who received the see of Jerusalem I should reply *that it is not to a single see but to the whole world that Jesus has given Peter for Doctor.*[36]

Soloviev has emphasised the extraordinary assertion that Chrysostom makes that S. Peter *of his own authority* might have appointed a successor to Judas. The whole passage from the Russian philosopher is worth quoting at this point.

"*Saint Jean Chrysostome a victorieusement réfuté d'avance les objections contre la primauté de Pierre, qu'on tire encore aujourd'hui de certains faits de l'histoire évangélique et apostolique* (*la défaillance de Simon dans la cour du grand-prêtre, ses rapports avec saint Paul, etc.*). *Nous renvoyons nos lecteurs aux arguments*

34 *P. G.*, lix, 477. Hom. 88, *in Joan.*, 477–9. τὴν προστασίαν τῶν ἀδελφῶν.
35 *P. G.*, li, 21. Hom. *de* 10,000 *talentorum debitore.*
36 *P. G.*, lix, 480. Hom. 88, *in Joan.* διδάσκαλον.

du grand docteur œcuménique.[37] *Aucun écrivain papiste ne saurait affirmer avec plus de force et d'insistence la Primauté* de pouvoir (*et non seulement d'honneur*) *qui appartenait à Pierre dans l'Eglise apostolique. Le prince des apôtres, à qui tous ont été confiés* (ἅτε αὗτος πάντας ἐγχείρισθέις) *par le Christ, était, selon notre saint auteur, en puissance de nommer de son propre chef le remplaçant de Judas, et si, à cette occasion, il a fait appel au concours des autres apôtres, ce n'était nullement une obligation mais l'effet de son bon plaisir.*"

Comment on S. Chrysostom's belief as regards Petrine prerogatives could hardly be stronger than these words of the Orthodox Soloviev. They are the very antithesis of those quoted above of his fellow-countryman and churchman, the Metropolitan Anthony (Hrapovitsky), whom, however, another Russian, Professor Glubokovsky, sometimes finds too liberal.[38]

Dom J. Chapman [39] draws attention to this assertion of S. John Chrysostom, that Peter, of his sole authority, was competent to fill Judas' place, but he considers that Chrysostom perhaps exaggerates and goes too far. But he very pertinently remarks, "I know of no more emphatic testimony to the supreme jurisdiction of S. Peter in any writer . . . . for I know of no act of jurisdiction in the Church more tremendous than the appointment of an apostle."

These are the passages :

> "Jesus does not say, 'I have prayed for thee that thou mayest not deny but that thy faith fail not,' in order that it may not perish completely. Peter has full authority in this business (i.e. the election of Matthias) because it is to him *that all have been committed.* It is to him, indeed, that Christ said, 'And thou, when once thou art converted, confirm thy brethren.'"[40]

[37] *La Russie et l'Eglise Universelle*, p. 153. "*On sait que l'Eglise gréco-russe attribue ce titre en particulier à trois anciens hiérarques : saint Basile de Césarée, dit le Grand, saint Grégoire de Nazianze, dit le Théologien, et saint Jean-Chrysostome. Ils ont une fête le* 30 *janvier de notre calendrier.*

[38] See *The Christian East* (Sept., 1924), p. 129. Art. "The Modern Papacy and Reunion." "That austere guardian and meticulous exponent of Eastern Orthodoxy, the Metropolitan Anthony of Kiev—Hrapovitsky—has recently expressed himself as favourable to the possibility of granting the pope a supremacy in rank *de jure ecclesiae* over the other patriarchs (cf. *Church Times*, Dec. 28, 1923 and *Tserkovniya Viedemoste*, 1923, Nos. 23–4). For my own part, I consider his declaration to be hasty and untimely, since Roman Catholicism, believing that it possesses far more *de jure divino*, will not respond to his advances."

[39] *Art. cit.*, p. 90.

[40] *P. G.*, lviii, 741. Hom. lxxxii, *in Matt.* cf. Hom. iii, *in Act. Ap.* 3. *P. G.*, lx, 37.

" After this lamentable fall, for no evil equals the denial—after, I say, this fault so enormous Jesus led Peter back to his first dignity and *entrusted to him the government of the Universal Church.*" [41]

" Since it was his great love which had made him contradict Jesus, the latter wishes to give him a lesson . . . . when he will be charged *with the government of the world.*"

ὅταν τῆς οἰκουμένης τὴν οἰκονομίαν ἀναδέξηται.[42]

And when Christ appears first to Peter after the Resurrection, it is

" *because Peter was the head of all.*" [43]

The Acts of the Apostles shows Peter exercising this primacy. It is

" *because Christ has entrusted to him the flock,*"

that Peter gets up and opens proceedings at the election of Matthias. [44]

Discussing the Council of Jerusalem, apparently Chrysostom considered that Peter could have settled the questions at issue right off, just as he could have appointed Matthias on his own authority. καὶ ὅρα ἐν τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ συγχωρεῖ πρῶτον ζήτησιν γενέσθαι, καὶ τότε λέγει.[45]

And in the following passage he gives a striking summary of the powers and activities of Peter.

" Like a general he passed through the ranks (of the army), examining whether such a part was compact, if such a part was in good order, what demanded his presence. See how on all occasions he goes about, everywhere found the first. When it was necessary to elect an apostle (*sc.* Matthias) he was the foremost. When it was needful to speak to the Jews and to tell them that the apostles were not drunk, when the lame man was to be healed, when the multitude were to be addressed, Peter always takes the lead ; when it was a question about presenting themselves before the rulers he is there, when concerning Ananias, he it is who undertakes it ; where healings were wrought by the shadow still it was he.

" Everywhere where there was danger, everywhere where there was a direction to give, he was there. There, on the other

[41] *P. G.*, xlix, 308. Hom. v, *de Poenis.* τὴν ἐπιστασίαν.
[42] *P. G.*, lix, 395. Hom. lxxiii, *in Joan.*
[43] *P. G.*, lxi, 327. Hom. 38, in *Ep. I. ad. Cor.*, 4.
[44] Hom., iii, *in Act. Apost.* i, 2. *P. G.*, lx, 35.
[45] Hom., xxxii, *in Act. Apost.*, 2. *P. G.*, lx, 236.

hand, where all was calm, he left the field free to the action of all, and did not demand greater honour (than the others)."[46]

Chrysostom's interpretation of the disciplinary dispute at Antioch between Paul and Peter is curious and ingenious, but unconvincing—that the dispute was really a sort of acted lesson to the faithful.

But, anyhow, it shows that the objectors to a Petrine primacy can find no support from Chrysostom here. However, there are other portions of his writings which the objectors quote as supporting their contention, passages which, if they stood alone and Chrysostom had not written all the extracts I have quoted (and many more like them), might justify them. Passages are quoted which seem to teach the entire equality of S. Paul with S. Peter, e.g. the following, where Paul says :

> " 'I went up to Jerusalem to see Peter.' After an apostleship so brilliant, he who had need in nothing of Peter nor of his teachings, he who, not to say more, was equal to him in dignity (ἰσότιμος ὢν αὐτῳ) goes, however, to find him as his superior and his elder, and it is solely in order to know him that he undertakes the journey. The same feeling which drives the faithful of our days to go to consult holy personages led Paul to Peter."[47]
>
> " He shows that he is not of an inferior rank, and it is not to the other apostles, but to the *coryphæus* that he compares himself, showing that each one of them enjoyed the same dignity."[48]

The answer that would be given, I imagine, to the objections is this : "Yes, all this is quite true." As apostles all were equal in teaching power and jurisdiction, " each of them was sufficient of himself and had nothing to learn from his neighbour."[49] But there was something which Paul recognised in Peter over and above what he himself and the other apostles possessed—a peculiar privilege—what Chrysostom implied in his term " *coryphæus* " " the mouth of the disciples " which induced Paul to go to see Peter, ὡς πρὸς μείζονα, as being ἔκκριτος τῶν ἀποστόλων.[50]

It is indeed true that Chrysostom uses the term *coryphæus*

[46] Hom., xxi, *in Act. Apost.*, 2. *P. G.*, lx, 165.
[47] *Ad. Galat., c.* 1. *P. G.*, lxi, 631.
[48] *ibid.*, 638. cf. Hom., *in faciem*, li, 379 and 373.
[49] *P. G.*, lxi, 637.
[50] cf. *P. G.*, li, 378 ; lviii, 535. For recognition on the part of S. Paul of S. Peter's superiority, see Hom. *in illud hoc*, section 4, *P. G.*, lvi, 275, also Hom., iii, *de paenit*, 4. *P. G.*, xlix, 298 and lvii, 380 ; lix, 142 ; lx, 171 ; lx, 660.

of other apostles besides Peter, e.g. he speaks of Peter, James and John together as the *coryphæi*[50a] and with Andrew, they are "two pairs of *coryphæi*,"[50b] and again Peter and Paul are coryphæi. But Peter is always *the coryphæus par excellence.*

. . . . . .

Granted that Chrysostom reiterates that Peter is the *coryphæus*, "the universal shepherd," etc., what evidence is there, it is asked, that he recognised these claims in the Bishop of Rome?

(a) Is there anything in his writings to that effect?
(b) Is there anything in his dealings with Rome that shows it?

With regard to (a), if it be held that all this labouring by Chrysostom of the honour and powers of Peter does not of itself demand the exalted position of his successors as its explanation, it must be conceded that there is little or nothing in his writings which explicitly and incontestably affirms that the Bishop of Rome is the successor of S. Peter in his primacy.[51]

Surely, however, if Peter is the *foundation* of the Church, as Chrysostom constantly affirms, and if the Church is eternal as the Founder made it, he must last as long as the building, the Church, which is erected on him.[52]

There is indeed one passage which may be a categorical affirmation of the primacy of the pope.

De Sacerdotio:[53]

"Why did Christ shed His Blood? To purchase the sheep which *He confided to Peter and those who came after him.*"

It may be urged that S. Chrysostom means no more by this than all those who have the cure of souls. On the other hand, there may be a reference to Peter only and to his personal commission: "Feed my sheep"; and Chrysostom soon afterwards actually quotes these words. And when one recalls his comments on them given above, as meaning Peter's "government" and "ruling the brethren," it is at least likely that here is a reference to Peter's successors in the see of Rome.

[50a] Hom. 56 *in Matt.*
[50b] Hom. 37 *in Matt.*
[51] The writer (Chrys. Baur) of the article "S. John Chrysostom," in the *Catholic Encyclopædia*, says: "There is no clear and direct passage in favour of the primacy of the pope"; and see *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique, t.* viii, col. 679. Art. by J. Bardy.
[52] cf. Soloviev. *Op. cit.* p. 156, *seq.* *L'Apôtre Pierre et la Papauté.*
[53] *P. G.*, xlviii, 632. cf. Marini, *Op. cit.* p. 67, and Chapman, Art. cit. *Downside Review.*

With regard to (b) his conduct towards, relation with, and appeal to Rome can only *demand* it.

On this last, the objection raised by the writer (J. Barmby) of the article "Innocentius" is to be noted :[53a]

> "The appeal of S. Chrysostom and his friends to Innocent during their troubles involved no acknowledgment of any authority of the Roman bishop over the Eastern Church. They apply to him, not as a superior or a judge, but as a powerful friend, whose support they solicit. Chrysostom's own letter, though in Roman editions it appears as addressed to the pope alone, was really written to the three principal bishops of the west. Its contents leave no doubt of this. Honorius, in his letter to his brother, speaks of the western bishops generally having been applied to, and quotes their views as being of equal moment with that of the bishops of Rome. And Innocent in his replies makes no claim to adjudicate himself, nor does he mention in this case an assertion of the universal supremacy of his see, such as appears in his letters to the Africans and to Decentius, but all along recommends a council of Easterns and Westerns as the proper authoritative tribunal."

It is perfectly true that after his unlawful deposition by the infamous Synod of the Oak (σύνοδος ἐπὶ τὴν δρῦν) Chrysostom sent the identical letter of appeal, not to the Pope only, but also to Venerius of Milan and Chromatius of Aquileia. The suggestion of the writer of the above extract seems to be that Chrysostom did not recognise any primacy in the Bishop of Rome. But a perusal of the history of the appeal, especially in the sequel—the breaking of communion by Innocent with the enemies of John ; the agitation for the restoration of John's name to the Diptychs—shows, in my judgment, that Chrysostom had Innocent chiefly in mind ; that the appeal concerned him primarily. Again, this section of history cannot be treated, as it were, *in vacuo*. It must be related, not only to that which follows, but to that which precedes : Chrysostom was not ignorant of Athanasius and Julius and Sardica ; the canons regarding the Roman see of which Socrates and Sozomen tell ; the not infrequent proclamation of Petrine privileges in which Innocent himself (as the author of the quotation acknowledges) indulged. Or did Chrysostom ignore all these ?

As regards the referring of the matter, which was primarily a matter of discipline, to a General Council—that "all along

[53a] *D.C.B.* vol. iii, p. 248.

(Innocent) recommends a Council of Easterns and Westerns as the proper authoritative tribunal"—the suggestion surely cannot be that Innocent himself had become doubtful of his own primacy ! ?

If Socrates is a trustworthy recorder, it was the wish of Chrysostom himself that the case should be remitted to an œcumenical council.

> "John taking exception to those who had cited him, on the ground of their being his enemies, refused to attend, and demanded a general council (*οἰκουμενικὴν δὲ ἐπεκαλεῖτο σύνοδον*)."[53b]

When, owing to the opposition of the Emperor, the council which was proposed for Thessalonica could not take place, the Pope, by his assurance of his communion to John, and, as we have seen, by his breaking off his communion with the Patriarch's enemies, did all that he could. Nor did his efforts cease with the death of the exiled archbishop. Much more could be said —these points are enough. Here it is well to record the result of the persecution of Chrysostom, in the words of an Anglican historian ; they have an important bearing on the development of our thesis, they corroborate one of our main contentions:— "But the see of Constantinople never recovered from the wound which it received in the banishment of Chrysostom. Its patriarchs, with few exceptions, were, from that time, little more than pliant officers of the court."[54]

53b *H.E.* lib. vi, *c.* 15.

54 J. C. Robertson, *History of the Christian Church*, vol. ii, p. 11. cf. Milman, iii, 438. *Op. cit.*

CHAPTER VIII

THE FIRST COUNCIL OF CONSTANTINOPLE, 381

ARIANISM was a declining force. The times now were indeed changed from those of Constantius, when the emperor would convene his double council (at Seleucia in Isauria for the Easterns and at Rimini in Italy for the Westerns (359)), that all might be made to sign a compromising creed and perchance be rewarded like Eudoxius—who would be transferred from the throne of Antioch to the imperial see of Constantinople.

Happily that tyranny was over-past concerning whose evil climax Jerome so memorably wrote: "*Ingemuit totus orbis, et arianum se esse miratus est.*"[1] For now the three emperors, Gratian, Valentinian and Theodosius, concerted to bring to a close the Arian troubles, to re-unite East and West and to heal the rupture with Rome which had endured so many years.

Gratian[2] was emperor in the West (375-383), and it was ordered by him that the Catholic bishops who had been exiled for their opposition to Arianism should be recalled: "those bishops who had been banished should be restored to their flocks, and that the sacred buildings should be given to those who embrace the communion of Damasus."[3]

Thus the test of Catholicity, let us note, is agreement with the Bishop of Rome. And Theodosius, in his famous Edict of Feb. 28th, 380 (called the Edict of Gratian, a law which comes first in the Codex of Justinian), puts it still more explicitly:

[1] *Dial adv. Luciferianos*, ix. *P. L.*, xxiii, 171.

[2] "Gratian was the first to lay aside the title and insignia of the Pontifex Maximus," Funk, *Op. cit.*, 1, 120. But the essential spirit remained, anyhow. The pagan tradition is accountable for the interference, all through this period, of the emperors in dogma and discipline of the Church. It has been contended that Gratian's act was peculiar to himself, and Servias, who lived in the time of Theodosius II, says Bk. iii, 218. "*Sane majorum haec erat consuetudo ut rex esset etiam sacerdos vel pontifex, unde hodieque imperatores dicimus pontifices.*" "Pontifex Maximus" does not appear on the monuments after the fifth century.

[3] Theodoret, *H. E. P. L.*, lxxxii, 1197.

"The Emperors Gratian, Valentinian and Theodosius, to all the people of the city of Constantinople.

"We will that all the peoples who are governed by the laws of our clemency shall hold to the religion which is demonstrated to be that which the Divine Apostle Peter taught to the Romans, by the religion which has been up till now imparted by him, and which it is known that the Pontiff Damasus follows, and Peter, Bishop of Alexandria, a man of apostolic holiness; that is to say, that according to the teaching of the apostles, and the doctrine of the Gospel, we should believe in One Godhead of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, in co-equal majesty in the Holy Trinity. We command that those who follow this law be called by the name of Catholic Christians; and all others, mad and insane, we condemn to bear the shame of heresy, and they will be punished in the first place by Divine Vengeance, and also by our penalties wherein we follow the Will of Heaven."[4]

Thus again Theodosius makes it a law that *the standard by which a man is to be adjudged a Catholic Christian is the possession of the Faith which Peter left in Rome and ever since has been preserved there.*

[4] *Cod. Theod.*, xvi, *Tit.* 1 *leg.*, 2.

See Dom J. Chapman's article in *Downside Review* (1925), on "Le Siège Apostolique." cf. Mgr. Batiffol, for an important criticism of the latter's interpretation of this passage, part of which must be quoted here, though the whole of pp. 98–101 should be carefully studied: "Mgr. Batiffol gives the decree in a note (p. 111) and summarises it partly as follows: '*Tous les peuples qui relèvent de Théodore se rallient à la foi de l'Eglise romaine et de l'Église d'Alexandrie.*" This is a strange misinterpretation on the part of so careful a writer. Theodosius says that all his subjects are to hold *the religion which the divine Apostle Peter delivered to the Romans, and which is recognised by his having preserved it there until the present day: in tali volumus religione versari quam divinum Petrum Apostolum tradidisse Romanis religio usque ad nunc ab ipso insinuata declarat.* Not a word is said about the faith of the Alexandrian Church. Theodosius, like the Eusebians, holds Rome to have been a school of apostles, and to have been the Mother-Church of the Faith from the beginning. The *usque nunc ab ipso insinuata* is even more precise. . . . The new emperor means that the religion taught at Rome by the Prince of the apostles* and preserved there by him, is to be the religion of the whole Empire of Rome.

"The Emperor goes on: *quamque pontificem Damasum sequi claret et Petrum Alexandriae episcopum virum apostolicae sanctitatis.* We may render this: 'And which is followed, of course, by Peter, Bishop of Alexandria, a man of apostolic correctness of faith.' *Sanctitas* cannot refer to moral qualities, which are not in question. Damasus is mentioned, not because he is a good man, but because he is the pontiff of the city already mentioned, where S. Peter has always '*insinuated*' his original teaching. The aged Peter of Alexandria is known to hold the same doctrine and to be therefore a man of apostolic (Petrine) sanctity, for he has been living for five years at Rome.—*Claret.*"

*So the Byzantine Sozomen paraphrases: "To have religion according as from the beginning Peter the *coryphæus* of the Apostles delivered to the Romans; this was kept at the time of Damasus, the Bishop of Rome, and by Peter of Alexandria."

In 381 was held the Second General Council, the first of Constantinople. This council, of which we possess little information beyond scattered notices in Socrates, Sozomen and Theodoret, is reckoned œcumenical now. But it was not so either in its convocation or in its composition. *It became reckoned as a General Council later, when approved by Rome and the West.*[5] At Chalcedon it is for the first time accounted œcumenical, and its Creed put on the same level with that of Nicæa,[6] and also because of this Creed attributed to it, though Duchesne and some others deny that the council ever produced a creed.[7]

It would be difficult to know, in that case, why the council met and what exactly it did.

In itself this council could at best claim to be a general council of the East, and even then, not of the whole East. There is no evidence that Pope Damasus and the Western bishops had been invited or that Western representatives were at the council.[8]

The objects of the meeting of the council were to confirm the faith of Nicæa, to deal with the Pneumatomachi, to appoint a bishop for Constantinople, and to settle certain practical and disciplinary questions.

Arianism had been everywhere in the ascendant in the East. The orthodox in Constantinople had neither bishop nor church till Gregory Nazianzen came to look after them. Then Theodosius' accession to power meant the restoration of orthodoxy. The presidents of the council were Meletius of Antioch, Gregory Nazianzen,[9] and Nectarius of Constantinople.

Of the Seven Canons attributed to this council three are wrongly assigned to it. It is the IIIrd Canon which specially interests us now—that which attributes the second place in the rank of sees to that of Constantinople. Photius says that the council was approved by Pope Damasus[10] He surely would

[5] Döllinger, *Hist. Ch.* ii, 220: "It was a Council of Oriental Bishops only, and acquired the authority of an Œcumenical Synod by the *subsequent* acceptance and confirmation of the Pope."

[6] Mansi, vi, 958.

[7] See Duchesne, *Churches Separated*, p. 53.

[8] But see *Ap. Theodoret, H. E.*, v, 9.

[9] For Gregory Nazianzen's belief in the primacy, see his "*Carmen de Vita sua*," *P. G.*, xxxvii, 1068.

[10] *Ep. ad Mich. Bulg. prin. Photii. Ep.* lib. i, *P. G.*, cii, 628, and see p. 87, M. Jugie, *t.* i, *Theologia Dogmatica Christianorum Orientalium.*

"*Les Pères du concile de* 381 *n'osent lui soumettre leur canon sur la primauté de l'honneur de Constantinople*, bien qu'il reconnaisse indirectement la suprematie de Rome."—Art. "Damase Ier," *D. T. C.*, iv, 35, by A. Clerval.

not approve this canon: "That the bishops of Constantinople enjoy prerogatives of honour after the Bishop of Rome, because Constantinople is New Rome."

Baronius argues that the canon is fictitious, because if the canon had been passed there would have been protests from the bishops of Alexandria, and that Anatolius at the Council of Chalcedon would have relied on this canon for support of his XXVIIIth Canon. But the argument has little value, because both Socrates[11] and Sozomen[12] give this canon among the others without comment.

Constantinople began at once to take the second place, and often with acquiescence of the bishops of Alexandria and Antioch. Nectarius in the council took precedence of Theophilus of Alexandria and Flavian of Antioch. S. John Chrysostom was charged at the Synod of the Oak with having ejected certain bishops of Antioch and intruded others in their place, while Socrates,[13] relates how the Bishop of Cyzicus having died, Proclus was ordained as his successor. But the people chose Dalmatius. "This they did in contempt of a law (i.e. of Theodosius), which forbade the ordination of a bishop without the sanction of the Bishop of Constantinople; but they pretended that this was a special privilege granted to Atticus alone."

Flavian claimed the right of interfering in the case of the clergy of Edessa and Ibas, instead of referring it to Mennon of Antioch.

We need not linger now over this Canon III, since we shall see more of its consequences later. But it is necessary that it should not be *misunderstood* as it is so often. It does not affect the position of Rome. It does affect the position of Alexandria and Antioch. The Roman Church ignored it, and here opposition was reasonable, since the position of Alexandria and Antioch had been confirmed by Canon VI of Nicæa. But the Easterns were becoming obsessed (now that the emperor was living among them) with the idea that ecclesiastical rank should follow the civil rank of a city.[14] The very words "because Constantinople was New Rome" show the supreme and unique position of Old Rome: Constantinople was to be "next"—though it is true, the canon would be the fount of the effort to make Byzantium as near as possible the equal of Rome,

[11] Socrates, *H. E.*, v. 8.
[12] Sozomen, *H. E.*, vii, 2.
[13] Socrates, *H. E.*, vii, 28.
[14] See below, e.g. p. 216.

and, indeed, in some strange minds the supplanter of Rome.[15]

. . . . .

The year after the Council of Constantinople sees the issue of that important document the *Decretum Gelasianum*, in which occurs apparently the earliest instance of a direct official appeal to the text *Tu es Petrus* (Matt. xvi) in support of the Roman primacy. For though the decree is so named, it is generally agreed that whoever was the author of it, Gelasius was not.

Professor C. H. Turner,[16] in common with the majority of scholars, holds that the first three of the five chapters or sections into which the *Decretum* is divided are Damasine—the work of a council under Pope Damasus about 382. On the other hand, Professor Burkitt,[17] influenced by von Dobschütz, who made an exhaustive study of the MSS., denies not only any Gelasian, but any Damasine authorship, and the conclusion arrived at is that this document, so important for its lists of the books of Scripture to students of the formation of the canon, is in reality wholly the work of some anonymous writer of the sixth century.

The generally accepted view (that of A. Thiel, F. Maassen and Zahn, following Arevalo, 1704) is that the first three parts of the Decree owe their genesis to a Roman synod held probably in 382 in the pontificate of Damasus. And certainly Damasus, both by speech and act, frequently asserted the universal primacy of the Roman Church. This primacy he always bases on S. Peter; and the positions held by the patriarchates of Antioch and Alexandria are, in their turn, assigned to them owing to the same Petrine foundation.

The passage of the third part of the Damasine decree which deals with the Roman primacy and in which occurs the possibly earliest instance of the official use of the text *Tu es Petrus* in support of the primacy of Rome, runs as follows: "*Sancta tamen Romana ecclesia nullis synodicis constitutis ceteris ecclesiis praelata est sed evangelica voce domini et salvatoris nostri*[18] *prima-*

[15] See below, pp. 333 and 377.

[16] *Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. i (1900), p. 554.

[17] *ibid.*, vol. xiv (1913), p. 470.

[18] Prof. Turner writes thus: *ibid.*, vol. iii (1902), p. 392, Art. "The Genuineness of the Sardican Canons": "If it be objected that a Pope like . . . . Damasus, under whom so much was heard and so much was done with regard to the prerogatives of the Roman See, would have placed in the forefront of his argument the synodical sanction for appeals to Rome given at Sardica, I answer that that is just what he would have declined to do. *We have his own testimony to the far-reaching assertion that councils could not give what Christ Himself had already given. 'Sancta Romana*

tum obtinuit 'Tu es Petrus' inquiens 'et super hanc petram aedificabo ecclesiam meam et portae inferi non praevalebunt adversus eam, et tibi dabo claves regni caelorum et quaecunque ligaveris super terram erunt ligata et in caelo, et quaecunque solveris super terram erunt soluta et in coelo.'"

Having remarked that the "most blessed Paul" by his death in Rome on the same day as Peter had increased the glory of the "holy Roman Church," the *Decretum* goes on to say "*est ergo prima Petri Apostoli sedes Romanae Ecclesiae non habens maculam nec rugam nec aliquid ejusmodi.*" To the see of Alexandria it assigns the second place, because it was in the charge of the disciple of Peter, S. Mark, *ipseque in Aegypto directus a Petro Apostolo verbum veritatis prædicavit.* Parenthetically one might remark that this seems slightly illogical, since Alexandria was only indirectly "Petrine," when the *Decretum* assigns the third place to the directly Petrine see of Antioch, where, as it explains, Peter had himself resided, whence he had come to Rome, and where the name of Christian had first arisen.[19]

Here, however, one should observe that although Alexandria was the second city in the empire, it is not on this fact that the *Decretum* bases its rank, but on its Petrine foundation.[20]

It should also be noted that the Decree speaks of three "Patriarchates" and three only. Damasus makes no mention of Constantinople.[21] It is to him only an ordinary see. The proposed Canon of the Council of Constantinople on the primacy of honour of Constantinople, although, as has been already pointed out, it necessarily if indirectly recognised the primacy of Rome, had no chance of being accepted by him.

It is impossible to follow the relations of the Eastern Churches to Rome reign by reign and pontificate by pontificate It would take too long. Besides, the Œcumenical Councils are the main quarry from which we obtain our material, and the

ecclesia nullis synodicis constitutis ceteris nostri primatum obtinuit.' Those are the words of Damasus, Synod of 382 *de explanatione videri.*"

[19] cf. Gasquet, *De l'autorité impériale en Byzance*, p. 109 : "*Le premier de tous était d'assurer leur indépendance, d'émanciper la papauté de la tutelle impériale, de la faire vivre de sa vie propre, sans qu'elle empruntât à l'empire aucun élément de sa grandeur nouvelle. C'est pourquoi les papes s'attachèrent à faire valoir cette descendance, et à se considérer avant tout comme les successeurs de saint Pierre. Au moment ou la papauté triomphante entreprend de se dégager des liens politiques qui l'unissent à Constantinople, le pape Adrien peut écrire à l'evêque Nigelramnus, 'Rome est la tête de toutes les églises. C'est en elle que toutes ont leur source. Cette primauté elle ne la doit pas aux synodes ou aux décrets de l'empereur ; elle la doit à la munificence de Dieu même.*"

[20] cf. Harnack, *Hist. Dogma*, ii, note 1, p. 150, and Baronius, in the note on p. 252.

[21] Soloviev, xxxviii.

writings of the Greek Fathers and the incidents between the councils only concern us in so far as they throw light on the councils themselves, and on the special point of our investigation—the place, function and relation of the papacy with regard to the Easterns as a whole.

CHAPTER IX

THE COUNCIL OF EPHESUS (431)[1]

I WOULD maintain that a study of this, the Third General Council, would of itself be sufficient to show the relations in which the Eastern Churches stood to the see of Rome in primitive times. All the points raised in this dissertation regarding the papacy can be illustrated, substantiated and vindicated from a study of the Acts of this one Council of Ephesus alone.

It has always seemed to me strange that writers should so generally concentrate their attention on the Council of Chalcedon, as if that council marked the high-water mark of papal development or papal assertion. I find for myself, exactly the same things here. And the Council of Ephesus deserves more attention than it has had bestowed on it, because there is here no " XXVIIIth Canon of Chalcedon " which people may utilise unfairly to cloud the plain words of a council itself.

. . . . .

The Council of Ephesus is of supreme importance as illustration for these reasons :

(1) It is the first of the General Councils of which we have the " Acts."[2]

[1] This chapter owes nothing to the *Le Siège Apostolique* (1924) of Mgr. Batiffol, which I am told, follows the same lines. I have not read the book. As a matter of fact, this discussion of the Council of Ephesus and the primacy was written more than ten years ago, and was published as two articles in *The Antidote* (New York) of April and May, 1924.

They are here slightly recast and expanded, and for the quotations of Nestorius, taken from the French rendering of Nau, I have substituted the lately published (1926) translations of Driver and Hodgson.

This chapter, indeed, was really the nucleus of the present dissertation. It was because of what I found in the Acts of the Council of Ephesus when investigating the theology of S. Cyril of Alexandria, that I was led to work backward and forward on the same quest—to see especially what other General Councils and other Greek or Eastern Fathers had to say regarding Rome and the Bishop of Rome ; to see whether they, like this Council of Ephesus, undoubtedly, without contradiction, acknowledge and act on the primacy of the Bishop of Rome ; whether they too assume and accept his duty of " strengthening the brethren," that is to say acknowledge in the popes a " universal jurisdiction," a world-wide dogmatic authority.

[2] As we have seen, there are only fragments of information about Nicæa and Constantinople I.

(2) It was an Eastern Council, and composed, with the exception of the papal legates, entirely of Eastern bishops.

(3) It is an Œcumenical Council, and is appealed to therefore by both Easterns and Westerns.

(4) We have the voluminous writings of S. Cyril of Alexandria,[3] the president and protagonist of the council, which, when they are considered, show independently what the words of this council concerning Pope Celestine and his office really mean.

(5) And lastly, we possess now the remarkable "Apologia" of Nestorius, written after his condemnation, his book of self-justification. This work, entitled by Nestorius *The Book of Heraclides*—probably with a view to preventing its destruction—disappeared for centuries, till almost twenty years ago a Syriac copy came to light in the Nestorian Patriarch's library at Kotchanes in Turkish Kurdistan. When we glance at this work we shall see that *Nestorius, the condemned of Ephesus*, at least recognises the pre-eminence of Rome and its bishop as being the see and successor of Peter.

But before entering into the history of this Œcumenical Council and exploring the writings of Cyril it is necessary to give two quotations which exactly illustrate the view prevalent to-day of the relations of the East with Rome—the assertion that the Orthodox East never admitted any Roman claims.

(1) "Recognition of the papacy as the West knows it was never born in the Eastern Church. Easterns, when hard pressed and needing the help of Rome, did from time to time seek to conciliate the pope by the use of phrases such as would please him."[4]

and

[3] See Art. "Cyrille (Saint) patriarche d'Alexandrie," *D. T. C.*, *t.* iii, col. 2476, *seq.*, by J. Mahé.

[4] Gore, Lecture II, *Catholicism and Roman Catholicism*. cf. the same writer in his *The Anglo-Catholic Movement of To-day*: "The kind of logic which passes from the idea of what ought to have been to the assertion of what was, is the negation of history and reason. So the dogma of the papal supremacy and infallibility as something substantially belonging to the Catholic tradition as held from the first, is plainly contrary to the facts of history. It was never part of the Eastern traditions of the Church. And the faith which accepts such a claim has really to triumph over history," *Op. cit.* p. 31.

See also his book, *The Holy Spirit and the Church*, pp. 203, 288; also "Appendix, note B," p. 207.

(2) "It is not possible, indeed, for us to linger delightedly —as we would wish to linger—on such ineptitudes as his amazing attempt to prove that the Eastern Church, which regards the papal claims of to-day as the foundation of heresy and the mother of schism, once accepted them."[5]

In considering the question of the position and function of the see of Rome and of its occupant, a study of the Council of Ephesus and of the writings of this Eastern bishop is therefore valuable and to the point. For in this chapter my object is not to show what the pope says about himself and his office, but what a General Council says about him and his office—and by so doing make plain what value there is in the two typical quotations with which this present discussion is prefaced.

The importance and weight of Cyril of Alexandria can hardly be exaggerated. "In truth," wrote Dr. Salmon, "Cyril *was* the Third General Council."[6] Both friend and foe confess his exceeding influence. "If we except Athanasius, none of the other Greek Fathers exercised so far-reaching an influence on ecclesiastical doctrine as Cyril; and if we except Augustine, there is none among all the other Fathers whose works have been adopted so extensively by œcumenical councils as a standard expression of Christian faith."[7]

Nestorius himself is a witness to the importance and influence of Cyril. Speaking of the Council of Ephesus, he exclaims:

"Who was judge? Cyril. And who was the accuser? Cyril. Who was Bishop of Rome? Cyril. Cyril was everything. Cyril was the Bishop of Alexandria and he took the place of the holy and saintly Bishop of Rome, Celestinus."

These are the words of the deposed and exiled Nestorius himself in his recently discovered "Apologia."

And Dr. Bethune-Baker, the latest leading apologist in England of Nestorius, quotes with approval the complaint of Nestorius.[8] With a vindication of Cyril's personal character[9]

[5] *Church Times* (April 6, 1923), review of F. Woodlock's book, *Constantinople, Canterbury, and Rome.*

[6] *Infallibility of the Church*, p. 305.

[7] Bardenhewer, *Patrology*, p. 362, cf. Loofs *Nestorius and his place in the History of Christian Doctrine*, p. 44. "In an astonishing degree the pope's actions followed the advice of Cyril." Cf. also Salmon, *Infallibility*, p. 303, and Bethune-Baker, *Nestorius and his Teaching*, pp. 38–9.

[8] See *Nestorius and his Teaching*, pp. 38–39.

[9] The estimate of a good many people of Cyril's character is the fancy

I am not at present concerned. All I wish to stress now is that both friends and foes (and no Father, I suppose, has more of the latter) are agreed upon his learning, his weight and powerful influence. On the one hand, are men like Dr. Pusey, or like Dr. Bright, who wrote: "In proportion as Christians of this age confess their faith in the atoning work of this one Christ, they are daily debtors to S. Cyril."[10] On the other hand we have men like Milman and Salmon, or "the modern Liberals (who) so bitterly hate him because he stood up so pertinaciously for dogma."[11]

. . . . .

The Council of Ephesus was called by the Emperor Theodosius II to settle the Nestorian controversy; to grapple with the insidious heresy which made of Christ two persons, and in the refutation of which the ancient term *Theotokos* (Θεοτόκος) became the touchstone—the battle-cry—"the very shibboleth of the true Christian doctrine."[12]

The immediate cause of the Nestorian controversy was the sermon preached by the priest Anastasius in the presence of Nestorius, the new Patriarch of Constantinople, a violent diatribe against the term *Theotokos*—and the active support which Nestorius proceeded to give to his *syncellos*. The archbishop began to commit to writing and to circulate the objectionable doctrines. The writings by which Nestorius soon sought to propagate his teaching were spread abroad by him over Egypt and even as far as Rome—they evidently came into the hands of the Pope. Cyril, the Patriarch of Alexandria, seeing the confusion it would make among the monks (Egypt swarmed with them), at once took measures to recall Nestorius to the path of orthodoxy. In the *Paschal Letter*, which it was customary for the Patriarch of Alexandria to address to his clergy, he takes, this Easter, the opportunity of expounding the Catholic doctrine. In his letter to Nestorius he trusts that the Patriarch of Constantinople will disavow such teaching as that Christ was the "instrument of the Godhead," or that "Christ was a man who carried God within him," by accepting the term *Theotokos*. The letters which he sent to Nestorius had no effect. They only brought in return epistles of sarcasm and

one supplied to them ready-made by Kingsley's fiction, *Hypatia*. The best corrective to that is to read Cyril's writings—a man is best known by them. And they are voluminous enough for the purpose. See also Pusey's Preface to the *Minor Works of S. Cyril*.

[10] *Hist. of the Church*, p. 371.

[11] *Memoirs and Letters of W. Bright, D.D.*, p. 337.

[12] Hefele, iii, quoting Gengler.

irony—the main point at issue was avoided (see Loofs *Nestoriana*, pp. 169, 174–180). And so, now, Cyril writes to Pope Celestine[13] and seeks his advice. The Pope holds a synod. The matter of the heretical teaching is fully considered. The Bishop of Rome gives Nestorius ten days to retract, or else Cyril is to excommunicate him from the Church, depose him and administer the see of Constantinople.

The tone of the letter which Cyril wrote to Pope Celestine when he had failed to regain Nestorius to the Catholic teaching has given rise to a certain amount of sharp writing.

" Nestorius," observes Prof. Heurtley,[14] " addressed the pope as an equal: Cyril in a strain of subserviency of which there had been no precedent on the part of his predecessors, but which would no doubt be very acceptable to a prelate who was ready to welcome whatever tended to augment the dignity and importance of his see." And Dr. Gore in his *Roman Catholic Claims.*[15] gives a rather loud echo of Dr. Heurtley.

[13] See Art. " Célestin Ier," in *D. T. C., t.* ii, col. 2051, *seq.*, by E. Portalié.

[14] *On Faith and Creed*, p. 151. But Dr. Heurtley wrote before the discovery of Nestorius' own words about the pope and the papacy in *The Book of Heraclides.*

[15] He repeats it also in his latest volume, *The Holy Spirit in the Church*, p. 103. cf., too, an Article in the *Church Times*, also in his Article in *The Christian East* (June, 1924). This contention hardly puts Easterns in an attractive light, but a certain agreement with it is supplied by writers of the opposite school—at least, in the case of individuals. But Cyril of Alexandria is most certainly not an example. *A propos* of this point Prof. Glubokovsky writes: " If Père Batiffol refers to the over-courteous and even servile style of the Eastern appeals to Rome, one must differentiate between convention and dogma, and not raise the first to the degree of the second." And he gives, in a footnote, an extraordinary letter of recent date as an example of this—a letter from the Metropolitan Dionysius of Poland to Meletius IV (April 1, 1923), on the former's recognition as Metropolitan, *Christian East*, p. 182. The attitude of Nestorius to Pope Celestine and the papacy will be considered later more fully. But it may be said here, that it gives an occasional illustration of the contention. " *Le pape agit d'une manière consciente,*" writes M. Jugie, referring to Nestorius' rather patronising pity for the " simplicity " of Celestine: " *lorsqu'il est de notre avis ou que nous nous figurons qu'il l'est, et qu'il agit d'une manière inconsciente, lorsqu'il nous désapprouve et nous condamne. Le procédé est assez commode. Il fut toujours cher aux Orientaux. Toutes les fois que le pape leur est favorable, ils proclament en termes pompeux sa primauté et même son infallibilité. Quand il leur est contraire, ils reculent rarement devant le schisme et font appel a l'autorité de l'empereur. L'attitude respective des deux assemblées d'Ephèse est, à cet égard, fort instructive,*" *Nestorius et la Controverse Nestorienne*, p. 295 (Paris, 1912). cf. Duchesne, *Churches Separated*, p. 145. " When in want of the pope's help, when there appears a chance of obtaining something from him, his prerogatives are clearly established, clearly set forth, placed in bold relief, exalted in all the pomp of eloquence. When, on the contrary, his help is not required, all his rights and prerogatives are promptly lost sight of or ignored." cf. Ignatius and Bulgaria. And that we must not take everything " Easterns " say at face value, is maintained by one of their own advocates, Professor

" It is quite true that individual Oriental bishops who wished to say what was pleasant, and men like S. Cyril of Alexandria, whose fear of the rising claims of Constantinople united his interests with those of Rome, recognised from time to time in a higher sense the universal pastorate of the Roman bishop, but their expressions belong to individuals only, under circumstances when interest put strong pressure on belief."

It is puzzling how anyone who has studied the Acts of the Council of Ephesus could write so. It seems impossible that one who had read S. Cyril's writings and the many passages in them and his speeches at Ephesus dealing with Peter and the Roman bishop could write in this way.[16]

It is the fashion in some quarters to represent S. Cyril as most unscrupulous in attaining his ends. Just as it is the custom to assign his fierce onslaught on the heresies of Nestorius to his jealousy of the Patriarchate of Constantinople (forgetting two facts : that it did not require the outbreak of Nestorianism to call forth his burning zeal on behalf of the truth of the Incarnation, and that the Pope clearly was unaware of any ulterior motive lurking at the back in Cyril's campaign), so with others it is the correct thing to put down the terms in which he addressed the Pope to a desire of " currying favour " with the patriarch of the West in order to gain his support. However, it is a commonplace to say that a person may be known by his writings, and in all conscience, S. Cyril's writings are numerous enough, and when we shall refer to them to explain the way he

Glubokovsky : " Rome was usually appealed to by the persons grievously wronged and seeking re-establishment of their rights. They acted so only because they had no other means available, as the authorities all over the East happened to be, at the time, inimical and persecuting. The only person remaining outside acute Eastern conflicts was the pope, and it was only natural that all the underdogs, finding no other protection and help appealed to the pope, and exalted his greatness, which seemed for those oppressed people, indisputable, when they compared it with the fallen past. They had to extol and laud Rome in order to secure for themselves a special importance of the pope's verdicts. Thus we are arriving at our first thesis that the above-described actions were neither constitutional or regular but extraordinary and sporadic." Art., " Papal Rome and Orthodox East," *The Christian East*, p. 181. In my opinion this argument that these Eastern appeals and addresses were mere compliments carries no conviction ; the instances are too frequent, and not of individuals only, but of *Œcumenical Councils*. And so again when Bishop Gore says : " I believe, indeed, that none of the Greek Fathers of the first six centuries connects the position of the Bishop of Rome with the promise of S. Peter " (Gore, *ibid.*), one enquires whether this assertion receives support from Cyril of Alexandria or not.

[16] Is this language of Bishop Gore quite fair, or quite justified, or quite worthy ? It seems to me that writers such as the above only give away their own case by their prejudice and vehemence and play into the hands of " Rome."

dealt with the Pope, we shall find it was not a new-fangled plan of getting the pontiff's support. Before the outbreak of the controversy he recognised the primacy of S. Peter and evidently looked upon the Bishop of Rome as his successor. I do not see how anyone can contest the proposition that the whole conduct of Cyril during the Nestorian controversy is a proof of his belief in the primacy of the pope—*and primacy by Divine Right.* To take first the records of the Council of Ephesus itself to show that the council did the same, Cyril in his letter to Pope Celestine remarked how he was compelled to write to Celestine because the canons and the customs of the Church demanded it.

> καὶ τὰ μακρὰ τῶν Ἐκκλησιῶν ἔθη
> πείθουσιν ἀνακοινοῦσθαι τῇ σῇ ὁσιότητι γράφω.
> κ.τ.λ.[16a]

Cyril had a great idea of the papacy. In one of his discourses he terms the pope

> "The most holy Father and Patriarch of Rome and Archbishop of the whole earth."[17]

So in this letter he writes:

> "Deign therefore to declare what seems to you right (τυπῶσαι τὸ δοκοῦν). Is it necessary to remain still in communion with him, or ought it to be proclaimed publicly that no one communicates with one who professes and teaches such errors?"
>
> "It is necessary that the opinion of Your Piety be also sent to the bishops of Macedonia and to *all those of the East.* This will give them the opportunity which they desire of strengthening themselves in the unity, and of coming to the help (ἐπαγωνίσασθαι) of the orthodox faith which is being attacked."[18]

The answer of the Bishop of Rome to this letter is at any rate the letter of one who was fully conscious of his own importance! *It is on this letter that the council acts. The position claimed by the pope is accepted by the council.* "Wherefore, assuming to yourself the authority of our see and using our stead and place with power (ἐξουσίᾳ), *you will deliver this sentence* with the utmost severity, that within ten days counted from the day of your notice, he shall condemn in a written confession his evil teaching, and promise for the future to confess the faith con-

[16a] *Ep.* xi, *P.G.* LXXVII, 37, 13. cf. *P.G.* LXXVII, 80, 84.

[17] *P. G.*, lxxvii, 1040, "*Encomium in Deiparam*" (I am doubtful whether Cyril is the author of this homily, however).

[18] *P. G.*, lxxvii, 34, and Mansi, iv, 1011.

cerning the birth of Christ our God which both the Church of Rome and that of your Holiness and the *whole Christian religion* preaches, forthwith your Holiness will provide for that Church. And let him know that he is altogether removed from our body.[19] We have written the same to our brothers and fellow-bishops, John, Rufus, and Flavian, whereby our judgment concerning him, yea rather the divine judgment of Christ our Lord, may be manifest."[20]

It would be difficult to give more peremptory instructions. And it should be emphasised here that sentence is pronounced and *Cyril delegated to execute it before there was any question of an Œcumenical Council.* In Celestine's name Cyril is to call on Nestorius to retract. If he will not recant he is to be excommunicated and deposed and Cyril is to take charge of his see.

The letter says this at the very least. As a matter of fact, it says a good deal more.

Dr. Bright, and following him Fr. Puller, translate the first sentence of the above quotation from the letter of Celestine to Cyril, as empowering him to join the authority of the Roman see to that of his own Alexandrian see.

But Celestine says "joining to yourself the authority of our see" NOT "joining to your see."

The Greek is *συναφθείσης σοί.* That is a very different thing.[21] He makes Cyril his plenipotentiary.

S. Cyril presided at the council. It is to be remembered that it was at Ephesus—and he was not Bishop of Ephesus; and still more, he was not *persona grata* with the emperor, who had more than a "sneaking regard" for Nestorius—his own bishop—the bishop of the imperial city. Dr. A. Fortescue[22] claims that Cyril presided as papal legate. Fr. Puller[23] denies it. (It makes, however, little difference to the main thesis.)

The Acts of the council say more than once that Cyril held the place of Pope Celestine *Κυρίλλου διέποντος καὶ τοῦ τόπον τοῦ ἐπισκόπου τῆς Ῥωμαίων Ἐκκλησίας.*[24]

Celestine had held a council of bishops who happened to be

[19] Mansi, iv, 1019.

[20] i.e. John of Antioch, Rufus of Thessalonica, Flavian of Philippi, Metropolitan of Macedonia.

In his letter to Nestorius which was read at Ephesus, Celestine threatens to cut him off *from communion with the whole Catholic Church, ab universalis Ecclesiae Catholicae communione dejectum* Mansi, iv, 1035, Mansi, iv, 1022.

[21] See also Salmon, *Infallibility*, p. 307.

[22] *The Greek Fathers*, p. 188.

[23] In a note on p. 376 of his *Primitive Saints and the See of Rome.*

[24] Mansi, iv, 1123, 1279, etc.

in Rome (430) to consider the question of Nestorius, *and they had decided it then, before ever a General Council was thought of.*

As Dr. Pusey wrote: "*The mind of the Church had been expressed in the previous year.*"[25]

Celestine himself might be said to have been president of the Council of Ephesus. We find, for instance, that, at Chalcedon, Ephesus was described as a council "of which the most blessed Celestine, the president of the apostolic chair, and the most blessed Cyril of great Alexandria were the leaders" (*praesides*,[26] καθηγηταί).

The Definition of the Council of Chalcedon speaks of the Council of Ephesus as presided over by Celestine and Cyril.[27]

In the letter of the emperor, confirmatory of the sentence against Eutyches, Ephesus is thus described, "when the error of Nestorius was excluded, under the presidency of Celestine of the city of Rome and Cyril of the city of Alexandria."[28] And the Greek Menologion (June 9) speaks of Cyril thus:

> "a most learned man, champion of the Catholic faith, whom the supreme Pontiff Celestine judged a fit person to whom he entrusted his own place in the Council of Ephesus."[29]

But, *and this is peculiarly weighty, Nestorius himself supplies testimony that the council was really presided over by Celestine;*

> *L'évêque de Rome (Celestine) lui qui avait eu le principal rôle contre moi au concile d'Ephèse.*[30]
>
> Driver and Hodgson translate: "the Bishop of Rome who was exercising the direction of the plotting of the Council of Ephesus against me."

These newly discovered words are indeed confirmed and anticipated by Bossuet when he writes: *C'est Célestin qui prononce. C'est Cyrille qui execute avec puissance, parce qu'il agit par autorité du siège de Rome. Ce qu'il écrit à Nestorius n'est pas moins fort puisqu'il donne son approbation à la foi de Saint Cyrille et, en consequence, il ordonne à Nestorius de se former à "ce qu'il verra enseigner" sous peine de déposition.*[31]

And Celestine had written to Nestorius:

[25] Preface to *Minor Works of S. Cyril*, p. lxxxii.
[26] Mansi, vii, 29. [27] *Ibid.*, vii, 109. [28] *Ibid.*, vii, 501.
[29] See also Nilles' *Kalendarium*, vol. i, pp. 75, 175; also vol. ii, for Cyril, and vol. i, p. 75, 471, for Celestine.
[30] *Livre d'Héraclide*, p. 327.
[31] Bossuet, *Remarques sur l'histoire des Conciles*, p. 524, *t.* 30 (Versailles, 1817).

"Alexandrinae Ecclesiae sacerdotis fidem probavimus et probamus. Et tu, admonitus per eum rursus, senti nobiscum. Cui fratri si a te praebeatur assensus, damnatis omnibus quae hucusque sensisti, statim haec volumus praedices quae ipsum videas praedicare.[32]

With this may be compared Celestine's letter to Cyril :[33] " It belongs to your Holiness, with the venerable counsel of the brethren, to put down the disturbances that have arisen in the Church, and that we should learn that the matter has been finished by the desired correction."

The conduct of Pope Celestine in the whole controversy is startling, uncompromising, unequivocal. There is no hesitation about it, no lack of assurance. *Certainly in his own mind, there was no need of a General Council. He had settled the question. He consents to a council.*[34] It will be of benefit in manifesting the Faith. To him, at any rate, the function of the council will be to establish and to execute the sentence of his Roman Council of the previous year. " The Bishop of Constantinople," says Milman, " was already a condemned heretic ; the business of the council was only the confirmation of their (Celestine's and Cyril's) anathema."[35] " In our solicitude," Celestine writes to the council, " we have sent you our holy brothers in the priesthood, the Bishops Arcadius and Projectus and the Priest Philip, to be present at the discussions *and to execute what things have been already decided by Us* (*quae a nobis antea statuta sunt exequantur*). We do not doubt that your Holiness will agree."[36] To his legates the Pope gives precise instructions. They were not to enter into the discussions themselves but to act as judges of the bishop's opinions. *Et auctoritatem Sedis Apostolicæ custodiri debere mandamus . . . Ad disceptationem si fuerit ventum, vos de eorum sententiis judicare debeatis, non subire certamen.*[37]

Dr. Pusey, I have pointed out, in his Preface to the Minor Works of S. Cyril of Alexandria [38] wrote : " The mind of the Church had been expressed in the previous year," i.e. in Celestine's Roman synod. And he continues : " *The Council itself was only a device of Nestorius to ward off his condemnation. He had already been severed from the communion of the greater part of Christendom.*"

As one considers the first sessions of the council and reads

[32] Mansi, iv, 1034. [33] *Ibid.*, iv, 1202.
[34] cf. *Ep. ad Cyrill.*, Mansi, iv, 1292, and *Ep. ad Imper.*, 1291.
[35] *History of Latin Christianity*, i, 206.
[36] Mansi, iv, 1287. [37] *Ibid.*, iv, 556.
[38] *Library of the Fathers* (Oxford, 1881), p. lxxxii.

its decisions, one has, once more, the evidence of the primacy of Rome acknowledged and as motiving the Council :

> " The Holy Synod said, since the most impious Nestorius will not obey our citation, and has not received the most holy and God-fearing bishops whom we sent unto him, we have necessarily betaken ourselves to the examination of his impieties, and having apprehended from his letters and his writings and from his recent sayings in this metropolis, which have been repeated, that his opinions and teachings are impious, we being necessarily impelled thereto by the canons and by the letter of our most holy Father and colleague, Celestine, Bishop of the Roman Church, with many tears have arrived at the following sentence against him : ' Our Lord Jesus Christ, Who has been blasphemed by him, defines by this present most holy Synod, that the same Nestorius is deprived of episcopal dignity and all sacerdotal intercourse.' "[39]

" Necessarily impelled by " both the canons and Celestine's letter (ἀναγκαίως κατεπειχθέντες). These are strong words. *And this sentence was promulgated before the arrival of the legates. This is a very important point.* It was not under their influence that the members of the council were ἀναγκαίως κατεπειχθέντες but by the letter of the Pope " their most holy Father Celestine," and by the canons.

But Bishop Gore, on the other hand, says " The East never acknowledged the Roman claims to a divinely granted supremacy."[40] Is it too much to say with Bossuet ?—*L'expression du Concile reconnaît dans la lettre du Pape la force d'une sentence juridique, qu'on ne pouvait pas ne point confirmer, parce qu'elle était juste dans son fond, et valable dans sa forme comme étant émanée d'une puissance légitime.*[41]

There were then three Roman legates at the council—Arcadius and Projectus, bishops, and Philip, a priest.

At the conclusion of the second session Philip made a speech which contains these words :

> " In applauding the letters of our blessed pope, holy members of the council, you are united to *the holy head ; for your Holiness is not ignorant that the Blessed Apostle Peter is*

[39] Mansi, iv, 1212.

[40] Lecture II, *Catholicism and Roman Catholicism.* cf. J. Chapman, note on p. 9, *Downside Review.*

[41] *Remarques sur l'histoire des Conciles, t.* 30, p. 524.

the Head of all the society of believers and of the apostles themselves.[42]

He makes the claim that as the head is to the body, so is Peter to the apostles, and so is Peter's successor to them.

And there is no evidence of any protest.

It is not necessary to build up an argument on the reading of the records of the work of the council accomplished previous to their arrival, to the legates when they at length reached Ephesus. But the celebrated speech of the legate Philip is uncompromising in its claims. It was delivered in Latin, a language which the Fathers did not understand, but as it was inserted in the Acts of the Council in Greek, and as no Father of the council, so far as I know, raised any protest, I must conclude that all accepted it.

I should judge that in Philip's mind there was no doubt that the popes :

(1) had a primacy of jurisdiction ;
(2) and had that primacy of Divine Right—as successor of S. Peter.

And by their silence, I should imagine the members of the council believed the same.

> " It is doubtful to no one, nay it has been known to all ages, that the holy and blessed Peter, the Prince and Head of the Apostles, the Pillar of the Faith, and the Foundation of the Catholic Church, received the Keys of the Kingdom from our Lord Jesus Christ, the Saviour of the human race, and that to him was given the power of loosing and binding sins, *who up to this time and always lives and exercises judgment in his successors.* His Successor therefore and Representative, our holy and most blessed Pope, Bishop Celestine, has sent us to this Synod to supply his place.[43]

I said above that the evidence afforded by the Council of Ephesus was particularly valuable and significant, in that we possess parallel evidence on the subject of this investigation provided by the writings of the chief actor in the controversy—Cyril of Alexandria.

With his much-discussed personal character, I repeat, I am not now concerned. But what is of importance now to remember is this—that his interpretation of Petrine passages was not a

[42] Mansi, iv, 1289. Philip describes Peter as ὁ ἔξαρχος and κεφαλή, ὁ κίων τῆς πίστεως, ὁ Θεμέλιος τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας.
[43] Mansi, iv, 1296.

sudden new-fangled plan of getting the Pontiff's support in his rivalry with the growing claims of Constantinople.

Before the outbreak of the controversy he recognised the primacy of S. Peter and looked on the pope as his successor.[44]

We turn now to the writings of the protagonist of the council. A glance at a few passages in the copious productions of this great commentator will be of value. It is worth while remembering, as Dr. Pusey has pointed out in the Preface to which reference has already been made,[45] that Cyril was primarily a commentator, not a controversialist. Certainly no one has been so caricatured as Cyril of Alexandria, even as no Father has been so hated and maligned. "Controversy was not his natural element. . . . His commentaries are the largest portions of his extant works."[46]

Orientals, it will be seen, more than once in the course of our investigations, are notorious for their love of high-sounding titles. If anyone ascribes to this characteristic Cyril's description of Celestine as "Archbishop of the whole habitable world,"[47] this laudation of Peter's successor may also be held to be somewhat discounted by Cyril's words in the *Glaphyra* of the apostles in general, showing that œcumenical jurisdiction is of the very essence of the apostolic office.[48] He is commenting on Jacob's blessing of the patriarch Dan, and he writes :

[44] Some writers essay to make a great point of the fact that when the great Greek Fathers and early Latin Fathers comment on the Petrine passages, e.g. Math. xvi and John xxi, they indeed speak of Peter's primacy, but make no reference to the primacy as descending to his successors. There is really nothing extraordinary in this—it was not necessary. Harnack in his Excursus, when treating of Tertullian and the Damasine "Gelasian Decree," shows that it would be the popes who would naturally appeal to those texts. And it cannot be denied that when they appealed to those texts they did so because they grounded their claims on Divine right, and not on any worldly influence and prestige, as the Constantinopolitan Church did, and only could. Athanasius and Cyril, Bishops of Alexandria, the second "Petrine" see, speak of Rome as "the apostolic see." Chrysostom at Antioch describes the bishop of that "Petrine" see as "another Peter," and explains that Antioch had to give up S. Peter the apostle for Rome. That surely is sufficient evidence. The history of the Council of Ephesus shows Rome looked upon and described as *par excellence* "*The* apostolic see," though there were many sees in the East which were of apostolic foundation and could be truly described as "apostolic sees." Here cf. Cyril's words at the Council of Ephesus: "Let the letter received from the Most Holy Pope Celestine, the Bishop of *the apostolic see*, be read to the Synod with fitting honours."

[45] *On the Incarnation against Nestorius*, pp. 71, 72.

[46] Pusey, *Op. cit.*, p. 99.

[47] *P. G.* lxxvii, 1030. *Hom. in S. Mariam Deip.* I am myself somewhat doubtful whether this work is really by Cyril. Its "Mariology" is so developed.

[48] The other apostles, equally with S. Peter, are addressed, e.g. by Chrysostom, as "the voice of Christ," "the founder of the Church," "the

"The glorious and admirable choir of the apostles are set for the government of believers and have been of Christ Himself appointed to judge. We have had for governors and have received for œcumenical judges (κριτὰς οἰκουμενίκούς) the holy apostles."[49]

But when we find S. Peter described as the "leader" or "prince" or "ruler" of the apostles (ἡγούμενος πρόκριτος etc.),[50] "the prince of the holy disciples" (ὁ τῶν ἀποστόλων πρόκριτος, τῶν ἁγίων μαθητῶν πρόκριτος) and as "the elect of the apostles" and τῶν ἁγίων προεκκείμενος μαθητῶν, we see an unique position recognised. S. Peter, again, is the Rock, though, in common with other Fathers, Cyril also interprets our Lord's words as said of the Faith or of S. Peter's faith. It should not be necessary to point out that the two interpretations are not contradictory, but inclusive. One cannot have S. Peter's faith without S. Peter, nor S. Peter without S. Peter's faith, it may fairly be argued.

One or two other condensed references to S. Peter will suffice.

In his remarks on the bringing of Simon by Andrew to Our Lord, and Christ's words, "Thou art Simon, the son of Jona, thou shalt be called Cephas, which is by interpretation a stone." Cyril writes:

"He permits him to be no more called Simon, already exercising lordship and power over him, as being His, but changes it to Peter, from petra, *for upon him was He about to found His Church.*"[51]

So again of the fulfilment of these words at Cæsarea Philippi:

"Then He names another honour: 'Upon this Rock I will build My Church.' Observe how He summarily manifests Himself Lord of heaven and earth, for He promises to found the Church, assigning immovableness to it, as He is the Lord of virtues, and *over this He sets Peter as Shepherd.* Then He says, 'And to Thee I will give the keys of the kingdom of heaven.' Neither an angel nor any other intellectual power is able to utter this word."[52]

tongue of the world," "wise architect," and "the common Father." It is obvious how appropriate these are to any and each of the apostles. But there are other expressions used only of S. Peter which could be used only of him, showing a special relationship with the other apostles, and superiority over them. S. Chrysostom uses them of no other, not even of S. Paul, for whom he had so great a veneration and devotion.

[49] *P. G.*, lxix, *Glaphyra in Gen.*, Book vii.

[50] See cf. *P. G.* lxxv, 577.

[51] *P. G.*, lxxiii, 220. *Comm. in Joan*, i, 42.

[52] *P. G.*, lxxii, 424.

As an instance of the second interpretation the following will serve :

> " Calling, I think, ' the rock ' the immovableness of the faith of the disciple."[53]

On that very striking remark of our Lord's, " Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath desired to have you ὑμᾶς (plural), that he may sift you as wheat, but I have prayed for thee σοί (singular) that thy faith fail not, and when thou art converted strengthen thy brethren," the Patriarch of Alexandria writes :

> " He therefore passes by the other disciples and turns to him who *is foremost and set at the head of the company*."

And further down he says :

> " The Saviour then forewarned him what would have been the result had he been yielded up to Satan's temptation, but at the same time He offers him the word of consolation and says, And do thou when converted strengthen thy brethren, that is, *be the support and instructor and teacher of those who draw near to Me by faith*."[54]

Reference may be made to the passage in which Cyril treats of the three-fold promise of our Lord to S. Peter after the Resurrection : " Feed My sheep," etc. After remarking that—

> " Peter started to reach Jesus before the rest, disdaining as it appears to go by boat because of the incomparable fervour and admirable zeal of his love towards Christ,"

he notes that he—

> " first made confession of faith,"

and further on that—

> " Peter took the lead ; becoming spokesman for the rest."

and at length says :

> " After each confession he heard Christ telling him in different words to take thought of His sheep, as He calls mankind in the parable."

Should anyone ask why our Lord singles out S. Peter, the answer is that as he had thrice denied his Master, so now he thrice confesses him.

> " Christ succours His erring disciple and elicits by divers questions his thrice repeated confession, counterbalancing,

[53] *Com. in Isai.*, lib. iv, *t.* iii.
[54] *Com. in Luc.*, xxii, 31. *P. G.*, lxxii, 916.

as it were, his error thereby and making his recovery as signal as his fall."

Again, says Cyril, our Lord Who had forgiven him so much expected corresponding love from Peter:

> "He requires him to say whether he loved Him more than the rest. For in truth as he had enjoyed a greater measure of forgiveness and had received from a more bountiful Hand the remission of His transgressions, surely he would be likely to feel greater love than the rest and to requite his Benefactor with the extremity of affection."

And the commentator thus concludes:

> "Therefore by his thrice repeated confession the thrice repeated denial of blessed Peter was done away, and by the saying of our Lord, 'Feed My lambs,' we must understand a renewal, as it were, of the apostleship already given unto him, washing away the disgrace of his fall that came betwixt, and obliterating his faint-heartedness that arose from human infirmities."

On this a writer to whom I have already referred remarks: "St. Peter is addressed because of his previous fall. In consequence of that fall he had either lost his apostolic commission or at any rate was doubtful whether he ought to use it, and he needed either to have it restored to him or to be encouraged to act upon it. This is the view of S. Cyril of Alexandria" (Puller, *Primitive Saints*, p. 119). It may be questioned whether this is the right construction to put on this passage of S. Cyril, and one must remember the previous quotation about S. Peter as "the Shepherd." One would hesitate still more before accepting the following passage from the same author. "But of all the Fathers, S. Cyril of Alexandria is perhaps the fullest and most satisfactory in his treatment of this aspect of the subject (commenting on S. John xxi, 15–17). . . . The important matter is that S. Cyril holds that the pastoral office spoken of by our Lord was not primatial, but apostolical, and that the whole incident was necessitated by S. Peter's fall, which had resulted in S. Peter's apostolate being, so to speak, suspended, on which account it needed to be renewed" (*ibid.* p. 127).

These passages from S. Cyril are sufficient. There is nothing original about them, as our consideration of the works of S. John Chrysostom alone would show, but they are given because

Cyril held the position of *President* of an *Œcumenical Council*, and a council where the primacy was recognised and where the *implications* of the primacy were necessarily involved.

In the light of the Acts of the Council and of the quotations from Cyril's writings given above, it is inexplicable to me how Fr. Puller can write[55] that in Cyril's view " the pastoral office spoken of by our Lord was not primatial," or how " Janus " (Dr. Döllinger) can write so emphatically that no support for a primacy can be derived from Saint Cyril.[56]

. . . . .

But even the *Condemned* of Ephesus acknowledged that the Bishop of Rome was the successor of S. Peter. *Nestorius* himself provides sufficient evidence of the Roman primacy. He knew of what supreme advantage it would be to have the pope on his side. When certain Pelagian bishops, expelled from Italy, had come to Constantinople, he wrote for advice to Celestine :

> " *Dignare nobis notitiam de his largiri, ne vel quidam, ignorando justitiam veritatis, importuna miseratione contur bentur.*[57]
>
> " *Saepe scripsi beatitudini tuae propter Julianum Orontium et caeteros . . . . et hucusque scripta de his a tua veneratione non suscepimus ; quae si haberem, possem eis respondere.*"[58]

He informed the pope of the new controversy also, but the pope was a long time replying, owing to the necessity of having Nestorius' letter translated into Latin, as Celestine says in his answer. Two other letters at least were sent to Rome, together with extracts from his writings, and some of them, circulated anonymously, had previously reached Rome.

In his very stimulating and provocative little book, *Nestorius and his place in the History of Christian Doctrine*,[59] Professor Loofs says (p. 43) : " Celestine of Rome had left unanswered at least three letters of Nestorius. The reason he afterwards gave, viz. that the letters of Nestorius had first to be translated into Latin, deserves to be met by us with an incredulous shake of the head. Was the real reason perhaps plottings of Cyril ? "

This " explanation " of the delay of Pope Celestine is very weak ; to me it is most unconvincing because so unlikely.

55 *The Primitive Saints and the See of Rome.*
56 *The Pope and the Council*, pp. 88 and 91.
57 *Ep. i ad Celest.* Loofs, *Nestoriana*, p. 166.
58 *Ep. ii ad Celest.* Loofs, *ibid.*, p. 170.
59 Cambridge (1914).

Unfortunately, Easterns and Westerns were beginning to be ignorant of each other's language. Again and again we shall see the drawback caused by this mutual ignorance. And, indeed, this language question becomes a great contributing factor to the outbreak of the state of schism between East and West.

A recent writer makes a far more reasonable estimate of Celestine's delay than Loofs when he remarks: "While New Rome had been planted in Greek-speaking lands, in the fourth century Italy ceased to be bilingual. *This astounding fact has not yet been adequately explained, but it remains.* In the fifth century, at the time of the dispute between Nestorius and Cyril of Alexandria, both sides appealed to the Pope. Cyril wisely sent a Latin translation by his deacon Posidonius, who knew the Western language. Until the deacon's arrival Pope Celestine had been quite unable to answer Nestorius, as he could not read the Patriarch's letter. It would thus seem that there was no Greek scholar in Rome at the time! In the same way the letters of the popes to Eastern councils were first read in Latin and then translated for the understanding of the Eastern clergy, and often mistranslated, Leo the Great complains."[59a]

Nestorius, condemned by the Roman Council, pressed for a General Council. To him now Celestine appeared "ignorant and simple"; taken in by the subtleties and sophisms of Cyril "the Egyptian," as he so often nicknamed him.[59b]

Ad Romanum Coelestinum convertitur, quippe ad simpliciorem quam qui posset vim dogmatum subtilius penetrare . . . seductionibus ejus mox tam alii quam etiam Coelestinus abreptus est.[60]

In his own book of self-justification, *The Book of Heraclides*, Nestorius recognises the pre-eminence of Rome and its bishop as being the see and successor of Peter.

Speaking of the affair against Flavian at Ephesus in the Latrocinium, 449 (the pope now is Leo I), he writes:

On n'y trouvait pas l'évêque de Rome ni le Siège de saint Pierre ni l'honneur apostolique, ni le Chef aimé des Romains.[61]	The bishop of Rome was not (there) nor the See of Saint Peter, nor the apostolic honour, nor the primacy, dear to the Romans.[62]

As was noted above, *Celestine virtually presided* at Ephesus, and this we have already seen Nestorius shows:

[59a] See *The Byzantine Empire*, p. 94, *seq.*, N. H. Baynes. cf. App. XI.
[59b] See also letter to Cosmos of Antioch, *Livre d'Héraclide*, p. 364, where the same estimate of Celestine's mentality is given.
[60] Loofs, *Nestoriana*, p. 204.
[61] *Op. cit*, p. 302.
[62] Driver and Hodgson, p. 345.

" L'évêque de Rome (Célestin) lui qui avait eu le principal rôle contre moi au Concile d'Ephèse." [63]

From these two extracts it is plain that though he knows he has not the Pope on his side, it never occurs to him, it never enters his head, to contest the pre-eminence and primacy. He simply feels pity for Celestine's simplicity and guilelessness.

When he discusses the case of Dioscorus, he writes :

L'évêque d'Alexandrie interrogeait donc comme celui qui a le pouvoir, et il parlait comme s'il portait même des décisions contre eux. Si (les Romains) lui donnaient l'adhésion de leur pensée, ce n'est pas pour accepter ce qu'ils voulaient, ni pour leur donner la prééminence ; mais c'est qu'il recevrait l'évêque de Rome en surplus, à son coté dans le cas ou il adhérerait à lui, sinon, s'il trouvait en lui un adversaire, on le chasserait comme s'il n'avait pouvoir en rien. Il voulait apprendre à tous à ne pas se tourner vers l'évêque de Rome, parce qu'il ne pouvait pas aider celui de Constantinople . . . Tu connaissais en effet (Dioscorus) tu connaissais exactement ce que Léon avait mandé à ce sujet à l'empereur à l'impératrice et à Flavien lui-même, et tu as pris au contraire la route qui conduit vers l'empereur pour la suivre en laissant celle qui conduit à Dieu, *sans t'en soucier beaucoup. Je ne dis pas assez ; tu ne l'as compté pour rien et tu as méprisé Dieu.* [64]

Driver & Hodgson *Op. cit.* p. 346, thus translate :

He, (i.e. the bishop of Alexandria) as one that had authority, then asked and spoke as though even passing sentence against them. Yet they (*sc.* the Romans) conceded however unto him their intended purpose, not that he should accept that which they wished nor yet that he should give unto them the primacy but that, if the bishop of Rome should agree with him, he should accept him as an addition to his party, and otherwise supposing he were found (to be) against them, he might remove him afar as one that had not authority even in a single (thing) wanting to prove unto every man that they should not look unto the bishop of Rome, since he was not able to aid him of Constantinople. . . For thou didst know, thou (Dioscorus) didst know accurately what was sent concerning these things unto the Emperor and unto the Empress, and unto Flavian himself, and contrariwise thou wentest by the road which led towards the Emperor and whereunto thou wast subjected, and left that which conducted towards God, and didst concern thyself very little therewith. But I have said too little : that is (I have omitted to say) that thou didst not reckon it anything at all and didst despise him.

This is a very strong passage indeed in support of the " Roman claims," when it is examined. One can only say that Nestorius himself hardly took the advice he gives to Dioscorus. He was somewhat inconsistent.

And when he comments on the events which followed his condemnation and deals with the affair of Eutyches he manifests the same inconsistency :

[63] *Livre d'Héraclide*, p. 327.
[64] *ibid.*, pp. 302–3.

Cette cause avait d'ailleurs été examinée depuis longtemps et la chose avait été jugée. Quel jugement ou quel autre examen était plus qualifié que celui fait par l'évêque de Rome? Celui-ci en effet lorsqu'il eut reçu ce qui avait été fait par les deux partis, loua l'un et condamna l'autre par un sentiment divin, *car ce n'est pas de manière inconsciente qu'il les condemna—Parce qu'ils eurent à rougir de la part de l'évêque de Rome, ils se tournèrent vers l'évêque d'Alexandrie, comme vers celui qui était porté à prendre leur parti et qui était l'ennemi de l'évêque de Constantinople.*[65]

Driver & Hodgson, p. 345 *op. cit.*, thus translate :

This then was already examined and he (had) also accepted the judgment. What other judgment or examination ought there (to have been) more than that which the Bishop of Rome had pronounced? For he, when he had accepted what was done by the two parties, praised indeed the one but condemned the other *by divine inspiration* and had not simply passed judgment on them. And because they felt scruples before the bishop of Rome, they turned back to the Bishop of Alexandria, as to one who liked to run with them and was an enemy of the bishop of Constantinople.

The Acts of the Roman Council referred to above have not survived, but the substance of its decisions may be found in four letters addressed by Celestine to Nestorius, to the clergy and people of Constantinople, to Cyril, and to John of Antioch. A fragment also of the speech delivered by the Pope at the Council on the θεοτόκος has come down to us. But the letter of Celestine to Nestorius is important. Again the same tone of authority and severity. The letters which have been sent to the Pope contain "manifest blasphemies," *Considerantes nunc interpretatas tandem epistolas tuas apertam blasphemiam continentes.*[66] The Pope devoutly wishes that the letters of which there can be no doubt, since they were forwarded by Nestorius himself, had not come into his hands, so that he is obliged to examine them.

In his quidem nobis vestigatus, deprehensus et tentus, quodam multiloquio labebaris dum vera involvis obscuris. Rursus utraque confundens, vel confiteris negata, vel niteris negari confessa. Sed in epistolis tuis non tam de fide nostra quam de te tulisti sententiam, volens de Deo Verbo aliter quam fides habeat omnium disputare.[67] To the clergy and people of Constantinople Celestine writes that their Bishop Nestorius *nefanda praedicat.*

Of this there was no doubt, since the writings were over his own signature (*sicut et ejus scripta ad nos ab ipso cum propria subscriptione transmissa*).[68]

[65] *Livre d'Héraclide*, p. 302.
[66] Mansi, iv, 1026.
[67] Mansi, iv, 1027A.
[68] Mansi, iv, 1035 D. C.

von Harnack has made the most of the *precipitancy* with which Cyril

John of Antioch, Nestorius' friend, urged him to comply with the ruling of the Pope, and this, before a General Council was mooted. Indeed, it was not from Cyril, but from John that Nestorius first learnt of the decision of Celestine and the Roman Council. He urged, he begged him to submit. The ten days given were doubtless short. The perusal of the letter of Celestine to him (John) which he enclosed, together with other letters of the Bishop of Alexandria, would add weight to his entreaties not to let the Devil flourish on unseemly and unedifying wrangles. The term θεοτόκος doubtless might be abused, but no doctor of the Church had ever rejected it. Let him use it, anyhow, for the sake of the peace of the Church.[69] And with this *Eastern bishop other Eastern bishops* concurred, as John tells us himself. At Antioch, when he wrote, there were present Theodoret, Archelaus, Apringius, Heliades, Melitius, and Macarius, lately become Bishop of Laodicæa.

Theodoret, of course, stands out chiefly among these. And what his conception of papal power was we shall see later, when we come to discuss the proceedings of the Robber Synod of Ephesus.

. . . . .

Though somewhat anticipating, it is not out of place here to quote a remarkable letter of two Eastern bishops, members of this Council, addressed later to Sixtus III. Eutherius of Tyana and Helladius of Tarsus were opponents of Cyril of Alexandria and refused to sign the symbol of union between John of Antioch and Cyril.

"In His perpetual solicitude for the human race, Christ

opened the proceedings of the Council of Ephesus (*History of Dogma*, iv, 183). In extenuation it may be said that there were cases of sickness among the bishops, and even death; that Nestorius, though present in the city and bidden, refused to put in an appearance; and that his friend John, Patriarch of Antioch, it cannot be doubted, deliberately delayed (though it is said he sent certain bishops ahead to tell the Council not to wait for him)—he did not wish to be present at his condemnation. (Mansi, iv, 1232. Pusey, *Op. cit.*, xxx.)

All the same, we may regret the haste of Cyril and the brusqueness of Celestine and his want of tact. "The original letters of Celestine," Dom. J. Chapman has recently written, "had been cruel, giving Nestorius no opportunity for defence, and demanding submission for obvious heresy through the mediations of the Alexandrian pope, the theological adversary of the Antiochenes, and the nephew of Theophilus, the enemy of Constantinople. . . . Had the council opened a few days later, after the arrival of the papal legates, with their important letters from the pope, and in the presence of the Bishop of Antioch and his suffragans, the deposition of Nestorius (or his recantation) might have taken place with less acrimony and with less disastrous results" (*Downside Review*, May, 1925, p. 109).

[69] Mansi, iv, 1064 A. B.

our Lord has prepared at each epoch shining torches to guide men of good-will, to confound their enemies, to destroy lying and to confirm the truth. It is thus that under the cruel Pharaoh he raised up the blessed Moses against Jannes and Mambres, that to Simon the Magician He opposed Peter the Victorious, and it is thus that against the enemies of our days He has raised Your Holiness, who, we have the firm hope, will deliver the universe from the Egyptian (i.e. Cyrilline) error. A New Moses, you will smite every Egyptian heretic and will save every orthodox Israelite. In view of the innumerable outrages committed against the truth, as we see the sparkling pearl of orthodoxy a butt to attacks unheard-of until now, on the part of those who have invented these novelties against the apostolic faith of our Fathers, it is our duty, we who are assailed by the most violent tempests, and are almost in the hands of pirates, to cry unto him *whom God has given as Pilot*, and by love for truth to keep him informed as much as possible. In your wisdom you will not answer us by disdain. You will not pass lightly over such a grave affair, but you will give it all your care and will award the punishment and the correction with all the firmness and all the assurance which is meet, and which can only be agreeable to God. On several occasions Your Apostolic See has sufficed to refute the lie, to reprimand impiety, to reform what needed reform, *to protect the Universe*, to the greatest glory of Christ, as well under the blessed and holy Bishop Damasus as under several other pontiffs famous and worthy of praise. This is why we ourselves venture to address to You our pressing demands in order that You should come to *the succour of the world*, both in the part which is in error, and in that which endures a tyrannical persecution because it refuses to give its assent to inacceptable doctrines. We, prostrate at the feet of Your Piety, beg you to extend to us a helping hand, *to stop the shipwreck of the world* and to command investigation into everything that has happened and to correct those abuses, that the holy shepherds who have been so unjustly sent away from their flock be recalled and that peace and former concord be restored to the flocks. We should long ago have hastened to Your Holiness, we who are of divers countries, that is to say, from the regions of the Euphrates, of the two Cilicias, of Cappadocia Secunda, of Bithynia, of Thessaly and of Mœsia, to pour out torrents of tears and bewail publicly the unheard-of evils which have rushed upon us, but we have been held back by the fear of

the wolves ready to lay ambushes for the flocks to ravish them, to lead them into error and into every kind of evil. We have thus been obliged to send in our place to You clerks and monks to represent us. We beseech You to arise without delay, and, in your burning zeal, prepare a great trophy against the enemies, having before your eyes the diligence of the Good Shepherd and His love for the strayed sheep. Imitate that great herald of the Faith, Paul, the Eye of the world, in whom we believe that we possess the pledge of our intimate union with Your Holiness. For he is our fellow-countryman, he, who after having destroyed error throughout the world, became the ornament of your Apostolic See. To him Blessed Peter held out a friendly hand and *associated him with himself* in order that it might be clear that to both was entrusted the safeguarding of the orthodox faith (*ut appareret ab utrisque aequam subtilitatem dogmatum custodiri*). We pray You once more, do not despise us, we whom many evils overwhelm. We fight neither for riches, nor for glory, nor for any other temporal interest, but for the possession of the true religion, for the treasure of the faith received from our fathers, for the common hope of the faithful."[70]

It is not possible to evacuate this letter of all significance by urging that it is simply a composition of empty compliments "in the usual Eastern style"—of men in distress appealing for help.

These assertions are apparent in the Epistle:

1. That the Bishop of Rome has a jurisdiction over the whole Church.
2. That this jurisdiction is of Divine Right, because he is the successor of S. Peter, and is the Pilot "whom God has given us."
3. He has a duty to the whole Church, to guard the Faith, to condemn false teaching, to correct abuses, to impose punishments, to receive appeals from "all the world."

And their testimony is really of all the more importance and consideration from the very fact that they were *opponents* of Cyril, who was "hand and glove" with the Bishop of Rome.[71]

Testimony to the same effect is afforded by other members of the Council.

[70] Mansi, v, *Synodicon Cassinense*, pp. 893–897.

[71] Note that Eutherius and Helladius write not only for themselves, but for all the dissentients from the Symbol of 433.

At the second session of the Council Theodotus of Ancyra said:

> "God has shown that the sentence of the holy council was just, by the letters of the most pious Bishop Celestine."[72]

Juvenal of Jerusalem, too, in the fourth session, declares that

> "John of Antioch ought to render honour and obedience to the apostolic see of great Rome, by which custom and apostolic tradition will that the see of Antioch itself should be directed and judged."[73]

But Juvenal perhaps is not altogether disinterested in his tribute![74]

In this investigation I have considered primarily what the members of the council—an œcumenical council—said about the pope—not what the pope said about himself.

But, inasmuch as there is no shred of evidence of a protest against, or denial of what Celestine claims or asserts for himself as pope, the only conclusion that can be drawn is that the members of the Council, and the members collectively, agreed with what he asserted and claimed for his office.

It is therefore necessary to bring together some extracts of Celestine's writings to the Council.

It has already been mentioned that Celestine wrote to Cyril to inform him that he had communicated his judging of the case to his colleagues "in order that *Our Sentence, or rather, the Divine Sentence of Christ Our Lord,*" might be known to the many.[75] And to Cyril himself, "*You will rigorously execute Our Judgment.*" It is with the same lofty conception of his office that he writes *to the Fathers of the Council*:

> "In Our Solicitude, we have sent to you by our holy brothers in the priesthood, the Bishops Arcadius and Projectus, and the priest Philip, to be present at the discussions *and to execute what has already been decided by Us* (*quae a Nobis antea statuta sunt exequantur*). We do not doubt that assent will be given by Your Holiness."[76]

The legates had precise instructions: "We command that the authority of the Apostolic See must be safeguarded. If there be any dispute, it will be for you to judge the opinions of others without involving yourselves in the controversy."[77] When

[72] Mansi, iv, 1289. [73] *Ibid.*, iv, 1312. [74] See p. 196 below.
[75] *Ibid.*, iv, 1022. [76] *Ibid.*, iv, 1287. [77] *Ibid.*, iv, 556.

the council was ended and the Acts had been sent to the Pope, he wrote to acknowledge their receipt. He *recognises that the Fathers have carried out his sentence,* though he does not agree with them in their treatment of John of Antioch. " As to those who appear to have partaken of the impiety of Nestorius and have participated in his crimes, although the sentence which you have passed against them is read (*sc.* in the Acta) nevertheless, We decide on Our part what seems better (*tamen Nos quoque decernimus quod videtur*). There are many things in cases of this kind with which the Apostolic See has always concerned Itself (*quae Apostolica Sedes semper aspexit*)."[78]

In his letter of 15th March Celestine wrote to the council: " It is true that We are far away from you, But Our solicitude makes Us everywhere present (*per sollicitudinem totum propius intuemur*). The (watchful) care of the Blessed Apostle Peter regards all as present (*Omnes habet beati Petri apostoli cura praesentes*)."[79]

While to the clergy and people of Constantinople Pope Celestine wrote: " What were Our cares and Solicitude for you during this intestine war? The nights passed for Us as the days, for, in these kinds of cases all time is short. . . An impious man has vainly tried to devour (the Flock) for the Crook of the Shepherd consoled you, that Staff to which He delivered His Flock when He was about to ascend to Heaven."[80] Here Celestine refers to the commission of Christ to Peter to feed His sheep, and implies that he is the successor of Peter, and is fulfilling that duty.

Much more could be adduced from the Acts of the Council of Ephesus to show what relation the Easterns of the fifth century believed themselves to stand in, with regard to the see and the Bishop of Rome.

These Easterns, by this Council of Ephesus, acknowledge:

(1) That Rome is *par excellence* " the apostolic see."
(2) That Rome is so because it is the see of Peter.
(3) That Peter held the primacy in the Church.
(4) That that primacy was conferred on him by Christ Himself, i.e. that it is *de jure divino.*
(5) That Celestine is Peter's successor, wielding his powers, " who ever lives in his successors and gives judgment."
(6) That in virtue of this succession Celestine was competent to depose a Patriarch of Constantinople and to declare to all what the Faith of the Catholic Church was.

[78] Mansi, v, 269. [79] *Ibid.*, v, 268. [80] *Ibid.*, v, 274.

One more question arises (though it will be more conveniently considered and with greater fulness when the survey of the Council of Chalcedon is concluded). What function did the Council of Ephesus really fulfil?

We have noted that, clearly in the mind of Celestine there was no need of a council. Why then was a council held? It was "a device of Nestorius," not simply to ward off his condemnation, but to prevail. The time was opportune for Nestorius to urge the Emperor to convene a General Council. He stood high in the esteem of Theodosius, while his great rival Cyril had irritated the Emperor by addressing his learned dogmatic epistles to the Empresses.[81] Now, therefore, was the chance for turning the rivalry between Alexandria and Constantinople to the advantage of Constantinople. But the orthodox, too,[82] especially the monks, were in favour of a council. It would give them, who had suffered so much at Nestorius' hands, a way of deliverance. Celestine also supported it, in that its assembling would not only afford the opportunity of setting forth and vindicating the Catholic Faith, but would also give Nestorius the opportunity—of which the Pope's letters were eloquent—of repentance and restoration. And evidently the council accepted this conception of its functions.

Ταύτην ἐκβιβάσεις τὴν ἀπόφασιν, wrote Celestine to Cyril.[83] Τὸν τύπον ἐξεβιβάσαμεν reported the council to the papal legates on their arrival and enquiry.[84]

"It is," Hefele remarks, "clearly acknowledged that the Pope had not simply, like other bishops, so to speak, passively agreed to the convocation of the synod by the Emperor, but had actively presented to the synod rules for their guidance; and had thus, not in the literal sense, but in a sense higher and more real, called them to their work."[85] "The truth shines more brightly, and is more firmly held," wrote Leo to Theodoret of the examination of his tome at Chalcedon, "when what faith had first taught has by examination afterwards been confirmed."

And so in this Council of Ephesus, the bishops apparently conceived their duty to be, not simply to register the decision of Celestine,[86] but to manifest to the world their agreement

[81] Mansi, iv, 1110.
[82] Evagrius, *H. E.*, 1, 7.
[83] Mansi, iv, 1020.
[84] *Ibid.*, iv, 1289.
[85] Vol. i, p. 11.
[86] cf. Dr. Bright, *The Roman See in the Early Church*, p. 155.

with it by showing the grounds and motives on which he had acted.

There is a considerable school of writers who maintain that the papal powers and claims begin with Leo the Great.[87]

But nothing in S. Leo's attitude will be seen which has not now been already seen in the claims exercised by his predecessor Celestine (not to mention Boniface, Innocent I,[88] Damasus Julius, Stephen, Victor), or which has not been already recognised by such " Easterns " as Cyril, Chrysostom and Athanasius. There is little if any development. Action on a wider scale maybe—a " development in the circumstances "—but nothing more.

And the evidence of the facts constrains one to agree with the energetic conclusion of a recent writer when he says, " The numerous historians who repeat each other's thesis, that S. Leo the Great's letters are the beginning of, or mark a new era in, papal supremacy, are guilty, to my mind, of an ignorance which is *crassa* if not *affectata*."[89]

Claims are made by Celestine, as they will be by Leo, and great ones they are. But one searches in vain for any the least protest against them from Eastern emperor down to the humblest child of any Eastern Church.

. . . . . .

It is convenient at this point, and on the whole best (though it somewhat interrupts the natural development of the Dissertation, which is to trace the part the papacy played in checking the distortion of the theology of Ephesus at the Robber Council) to deal briefly with two subjects which arise out of the Council of Ephesus.

(1) The autonomy of the Church of Cyprus.
(2) The casting out of the Nestorians from the Church and the spread of their heresy.

We deal with them, that is, in so far as they illustrate Eastern beliefs regarding Petrine and papal prerogatives and claims.

. . . . . .

[87] e.g. Bp. Gore in *The Holy Spirit in the Church*.

[88] cf. Innocent's reply to the request of the Africans in the Pelagian trouble. cf. Appendices IX and X.

That the claims were not novel is shown by the account of an unsympathetic historian. " An application of this kind could hardly fail to be welcome to Innocent, and he readily complied with the request, taking occasion to accompany his consent with much swelling language about the dignity of his see."—*Hist. of Chr. Ch.*, vol. ii, p. 149, by J. C. Robertson.

[89] J. Chapman, Art. " The Patristic Period " in *The Papacy*, p. 41.

I

At the opening of the Council of Ephesus the question of the autonomy of the *Church of Cyprus* was brought forward anew.

Cyprus was proud of the fact that S. Barnabas had evangelised it and founded its Church. It claimed therefore to be an "apostolic" church.[1]

Just at the time of the summoning of the council, Troilus, Archbishop of Constantia, died, and the Cypriotes thought the occasion opportune to assert the independence of their Church from Antioch. John of Antioch took steps to stop the election of a successor, but the Cypriotes elected Rheginus, and he went to Ephesus with his three suffragans.

These bishops of Cyprus at the Council of Ephesus appealed to the Fathers to free their Church from the jurisdiction of Antioch, on the ground that originally it had not been subject and that considerable force had been used upon them to get rid of their independence.

The Fathers of Ephesus were not pleased with John of Antioch because of his deliberate delay,[2] and he was also out of favour with them because at the time he was anti-Cyrilline and supporting Nestorius.

Rheginus therefore profited by these circumstances to vindicate the rights of his Church.

The Sixth Canon of Nicæa had recognised Cyprus as being in the jurisdiction of Antioch, but during the schism at Antioch the arrangement had been disturbed, and when the schism was healed, Pope Innocent I wrote to Alexander of Antioch that the old status should be restored. Dr. Fortescue says that Cyprus, being part of the Roman civil diocese of the East, which

[1] R. Janin, *Les Eglises Orientales*, p. 166. Pargoire, *Op. cit.* p. 156.

[2] The action of Cyril of Alexandria in speedily opening the council and deciding not to await the arrival of John of Antioch has been the subject of a good deal of vituperation or criticism (and that not only on the part of non-Catholic writers). But a glance at the records will show that this criticism is unjustifiable. John was deliberately delaying. When within six days of Ephesus he sent a letter to Cyril expressing hope to be there in time. (Mansi, iv, 1121. cf. Hefele, vol. iii.) After waiting sixteen days, messengers arrived from John: "If I delay, do your work." (Mansi, iv, 1229, 1332.) It was not altogether unnatural that he should shrink from taking part in the condemnation of Nestorius, his friend. "He knew that Nestorius would be condemned" (Mansi, iv, 1232). And there was another reason why Cyril should be anxious to proceed with the work for which they had assembled. Sickness had broken out among the bishops; and some of them had died. (Dr. Bright, *Waymarks in Church History*, p. 148, in his prejudice fails to take account of the reports of the council itself to the pope and the emperor.) cf. Dom J. Chapman, *Art. cit. Downside Review.*

became the Antiochene Patriarchate, it undoubtedly, at first, obeyed Antioch ; and that it was probably the Arian troubles during the schism of Antioch which suggested the independence of the Church of Cyprus to the Metropolitan. [3]

Several members of the council raised the point of the Sixth Canon of Nicæa, and asked whether the Archbishop of Constantia had ever been nominated by the Patriarch. The Cypriote bishops assured them that their metropolitan had always been consecrated, not at Antioch, but by his own suffragans—this in the East being the mark of an autocephalous Church. Zeno, Bishop of Kurium, was emphatic on this. [4]

The fathers recognised the Cypriote claim, with the proviso that if the Patriarch of Antioch could prove that he had had jurisdiction over Cyprus before the time of St. Epiphanius, then he was to return into full possession of his rights. The patriarchate of Antioch did not, however, henceforth renounce its claims. Fifty years later the dispute was re-opened by the Monophysite patriarch, Peter the Fuller, and he, as we shall see, had a great supporter in the Emperor Zeno.

Then Anthimus, Archbishop of Salamine (Constantia), through a vision discovered the body of S. Barnabas with a copy of S. Matthew, written by his own hand, lying on his breast. The relics are conveyed to Constantinople, the Patriarch Acacius is requested to judge the matter. Anthimus claims the apostolic origin of his Church and its autonomy. The relics—the miraculous proof—carried the case ; the arguments of Antioch did not prevail against them and the reasoning of Anthimus. [5]

The Emperor Zeno guaranteed Cyprus the autocephalous status demanded. The metropolitan was accorded vestments of purple silk, the use of a sceptre instead of a cross, the right to sign his name in red letters, and to be called " His Beatitude."

But, as the following extract shows, though autonomous, Cyprus still believed in the supreme position of the Roman see.

To Pope Theodore I, during the Monothelite controversy, the Bishop of Cyprus, Sergius, wrote a letter from his synod (643) which puts quite plainly the belief of that autocephalous Church, at that time, the seventh century, in the primacy of the pope :

> " *O holy Head, Christ our God has established Your Apostolic See, as an immovable foundation fixed by God Himself,* and as

[3] *Op. cit.* p. 47.

[4] Mansi, iv, 1468. Art. " Eglise de Chypre," by A. Palmieri, in *D. T. C. t.* ii, col. 2424, *seq.*

[5] Robertson, *Hist. Chr. Ch.*, ii, 356.

a column where the Faith is inscribed in luminous characters. *You are, indeed, as the infallible voice of the Divine Word proclaimed, Peter* ; and on Your foundation the columns of the Church have been planted ; into Your hands He has put the keys of the Kingdom of the heavens. You, He ordered to bind and loose with authority on earth and in heaven. You have been established as destroyer of profane heresies, and doctor of the orthodox and immaculate Faith. Do not neglect, O Father, the Faith of our fathers, imperilled and tossed by the waves. Disperse the power of the foolish by the light of Your divine knowledge, O Most Holy, and destroy the blasphemies and the arrogance of these teachers recently risen, who preach novel doctrines. For nothing is wanting to Your orthodox and apostolic definition and tradition for the augmentation of the Faith among us. For we, (O inspired one, You who hold converse with the holy Apostles and sit with them) believe and confess from of old since our very swaddling clothes, teaching according to the holy and God-fearing Pope Leo, and declaring that each Nature works with the communion of the Other. . . . May God the Creator of all, preserve for many years our all-Holy Lord for the stability of His holy Churches and the orthodox Faith, the Good Shepherd, who lay down Your own life for Your spiritual sheep, and who chase away the ravages of the wolf with Your pastoral staff." [6]

As a result Pope Theodore condemned in his Roman Council (638) Paul and Pyrrhus. [7]

II

Nestorianism, expelled from the Church, now propagated itself and rapidly spread in a really extraordinary way. Later its missionary activities were truly remarkable.

It may seem strange at first sight, that the Syrian Church should become Nestorian, since Nestorius was not a Syrian. Nor did he write in Syriac, but in Greek. His *Book of Heraclides*, though existing now only in a Syriac version, was written in Greek. Nestorius, as Cyril of Alexandria says, owed his " darkening " to Diodore of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia. [8] And these two men were held in the greatest veneration by the Syrians. Hence, in the attack on Nestorius they were led to see an attack on Diodore and Theodore. Religion in the East (it is seen again and again in our period) is often a matter

[6] Mansi, x, 914. [7] See below p. 27.
[8] See Pusey : Introduction to *S. Cyril's Minor Works*.

of nationality. The East became inclined to Nestorianism because the empire rejected it.

When John of Antioch was reconciled with Cyril, the Nestorian party were out of communion with their own patriarch. Many went to Edessa. They would tell how that John was a supporter of Cyril in his war against Nestorius. And Nestorius, though their hearers knew little about him personally, would be represented as believing what their venerated masters, Diodore and Theodore, taught. The School of Edessa now becomes the headquarters of Nestorianism, though Rabbulas,[9] the bishop, was a Cyrilline. But the Nestorians were ably led by Ibas and Barsumas, and the latter, when there was a Monophysite reaction in Edessa, went to Persia, and thus by his influence made the Persian Church Nestorian too.

When Nestorianism spreads it finds a congenial soil in the Syrian Churches. But in embracing Nestorianism the members of these communities retain the belief in the primacy and authority of Peter that their forefathers had. Mgr. Khayyath[10] has brought together a mass of evidence of this in the documents of the Chaldean Church. Frequently it sings, not only at the feast of S. Peter, " Blessed art thou, O Rome most famous, royal city, handmaid of the Heavenly Spouse, in whom, as in heaven, dwell the two heralds of the Truth, Peter, the Chief of the Apostles, on whose firmness Our Lord has built His faithful Church, and Paul the Elect and the Apostle." They never mention S. Peter without adding " Prince of the Apostles " the name of his dignity and " peace to him," which is a sign of respect and veneration.

Another striking passage is that where they sing : " O wise Architect, constructor of the Churches, Peter, to whom thy Lord has given the keys of spiritual treasure, in order to loose all things on the Earth as in Heaven. O Simon Peter, holder of the keys of above and below ! O Peter, Prince of the Apostles, Founder of the Church ! Blessed art thou, Peter, thou who art the foundation ! Peter the Chief, Paul the Elect have established unity in the Church ! The Church by the priesthood of Peter was enriched. Prince of the disciples Simon, son of Jona, on whom our Lord has built his Church ! This grace which Simon, Prince of the Apostles, received came by succession in all generations, and it perfects the faithful, and

[9] See Lagrange, *Mélanges d'Histoire Religieuse*, p. 187, *seq.* A. Fortescue, *The Lesser Eastern Churches*, p. 75.

[10] *Syri Orientales seu Chaldaei Nestoriani et Romanorum Pontificum primatus* (Rome, 1870), by Mgr. Khayyath, Archevêque Chaldéen d'Amadia. See also *Revue de l'Orient Chrétien*, vol. i, 1896, p. 137 *seq.*

it elects the priests to perform the sacraments, and by their hands it works wonders. . . . It is Simon the Holy, and all the Kings and tyrants will not prevail against the Church of which the base reposes on him. It is Simon the Holy to whom Our Lord has given power over the Church which is on Earth and over that which is in heaven."

The Patriarch Dadjesu had presided over a council of his nation in 423. There was enacted the following : " It is in no wise permitted to disciples to lift themselves up against their master and to make themselves their judges ; Our Lord has in no way given them this power ; but in the Holy Church everyone ought to be perfect, and as there is one only true Father, and only one Saviour, His Son, and One Only Spirit the Comforter, in the same way there is only one dispenser in His House, the faithful Simon, son of Jona, who was named Peter and who received this promise : " On this Rock I will build My Church, and I will give to thee the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven. But Christ did not say to all the disciples, ' On you will I build, to you will I give.' And, although the priesthood has been given to all the apostles the Princedom unique has not been given to all, but, as it is with the only true God, so is it also with the special Master of His House, to the end that he may be for his brethren Chief, Governor and Dispenser."

Agapitus, a bishop, at this same council spoke thus :

> " You know, Fathers, that at all times divisions and contentions have arisen amongst us, but the Western Fathers showed themselves defenders and supporters of the Sole paternity, in which we, sons and disciples, are bound and united, as all the members of one body to the head which rules the members."

Narses is to the " Chaldeans " next to S. Ephraem. In one of his sermons he says :

> " Simon preached the Gospel to the country of the Romans . . . . The Prince of the Apostles took the capital of the empire and put it and kept it in the fortress of the Faith. He first confessed the Divinity of the Son, and he first offered the sacrifice of the conversion of the Gentiles. He laid down his confession of faith in the likeness of a rock at the commencement of a house, and he edified and brought together the peoples hitherto divided, with the supports of love. He preached at Rome, and the temples of idolatry were shaken and he overthrew the superstition which the devils

had raised for the worship of vanity . . . . his voice terrified, ... Saint Mark cultivated the seed which Peter scattered in Rome. . . . He built his doctrine on the faith of The Elect Rock, without in the least fearing the noise of the tempests of the spirit of error."

Narses, in another sermon at Pentecost, compares S. Peter with Moses :

" The Prince of the Apostles is there calm and joyful, and peace rules in the soul of his companions. Moses cries, and my thoughts are full of fear and dread ; Simon announces faith hope and love. Moses rent the robe which the Bridegroom sent to the Bride ; and Simon clothes with the robe of glory the Church of the Gentiles. Simon makes resound a new voice in the country of Rome and teaches there the religion of the Sole Creator. The Prince of the Apostles had for his lot the Mother of Cities and as in a head he placed there the eyes of Faith."

Elias, Bishop of Anbara, in the front rank of *Nestorian theologians,* has the following in one of his discourses :

" Wise men ask why the Saviour gave to Simon the name of Peter. Christ Himself is the true rock, why has he given to another the name of Peter and of Chief of the Building ? Christ the true Rock, had to return to heaven, and he established his vicar on Earth, and named him the Rock of the Edifice. He bears in himself the image and resemblance of his Master and Lord on earth, and he is mediator between us and the Son, and he is pontiff like his prototype. . . . Christ is the great pontiff between God and us, and he has chosen and established his vice-gerent on earth for the Churches. Simon. . . . the foundation of the Faith. He gave him his special name of Peter, for hitherto no one had been named Peter to become the foundation of the Church and the head of the Building. He did not call him by his own name of Saviour, for there had been saviours among the people, but Christ had made their power to cease, and he by no means wished that to cease which he gave to the son of Jona. He did not call him either Christ for there had been Christs in Juda, and the Saviour had abrogated them, but he in no wise wished to supersede Peter as those. . . ."

The Lord called Simon therefore by the name of Peter (1) in order that that which is built by Peter might remain firm and stable. (2) To the end that on him might be laid and might be

raised solidly the building up to the height of the roof. (3) He called him Peter, as if he might have said the base, the foundation, and the chief corner-stone of the Holy Church, the rock of the edifice of the faith. (4) He called him Peter so that he might bear the edifice that the construction would be raised perpendicularly, and that the building might remain unchangeable and unshakable, in spite of rains, tempests, winds and torrents. (5) In short, he called him Peter to mark the firmness of the faith and to prove that the true religion of Christ is not built on the sand.[11]

. . . . . .

The heresy of Eutyches, the swing of the pendulum from Nestorianism, provided once more opportunity for the exercise of papal claims or papal prerogatives.

The times had become very difficult. The great names of the previous controversy had been removed by death. The passage of five years had made great differences. John of Antioch died in 442, and was succeeded by his nephew, Domnus. Cyril of Alexandria died in 444, and was succeeded by his nephew, Dioscorus. The see of Constantinople, too, became vacant by the death of Proclus in 447, and Flavian now reigned in his stead—much to the regret, it is said, of the old archimandrite, Eutyches, who, owing to his influence with his godson, Chrysaphius, the emperor's chief chamberlain, had hoped to become archbishop himself. For Chrysaphius hated Flavian.[12] Between Domnus and Dioscorus there soon arose a great enmity, which was not lessened when Domnus had allowed Proclus of Constantinople to take precedence of him at a synod, thus giving support to the Third Canon of Constantinople and the growing ambition of the imperial see, while, on the other hand, Domnus was a friend of Flavian's. Unfortunately Domnus' strength did not equal his faith. Contrary to the advice of Euthymius, the abbot of his monastery, he thought he was called upon to leave his retreat in order to recall his uncle John to the path of orthodoxy ; for grief at the latter's defection at Ephesus caused him to disobey the saintly abbot, who, indeed, foretold the troubles that would befall him.[13] For eight years Domnus held the patriarchal throne of Antioch, but " he hardly combined the harmlessness of the dove with the wisdom of the serpent."

[11] See *Revue de l'Orient Chrétien*, vol. i, p. 137, *seq.* (1896) for these references.

[12] See Adolphe Regnier, *S. Léon le Grand*, p. 48, *seq.*, and *Theoph. Chron. P. G.*, cviii, 256, *seq.*

[13] R. Génier, *Vie de S. Euthyme le Grand* (Paris, 1909), p. 154.

This brief *résumé* makes plain the rivalries likely to arise between the sees of Alexandria and Antioch and Constantinople.

Flavian happened to be holding a synod at Constantinople in 448[14] to deal with some question which had arisen between Florentius, Bishop of Sardes, the Metropolitan of Lydia, and two of the bishops of his province, when, to the astonishment of the council, Eusebius of Dorylæum, a quondam friend of Eutyches, accused the latter of heresy.

The zeal which Eutyches had shown in combating the Nestorian heresy had earned the praise of Leo the Great.[15] But the "foolish old man," as Leo termed him later, had so exaggerated his opposition that he had evolved another heresy at the other extreme, and obstinately clung to his fancies.

Eutyches was summoned to the council, but refused to attend, urging his age, the state of his health, and his vow which confined him to his monastery. However, the third citation brought him, for he feared that he might be condemned for contumacy. And he came escorted by a band of soldiers and court officials. The defence he made of his teaching was so unsound that he was condemned and deprived of his rank and dignity.

Apparently in a low voice (πράως)[16] Eutyches appealed to the Pope and to the patriarchs of Alexandria and Jerusalem and their synods. There was obvious skill or craft in his choice of authorities and judges. But most members of the council denied that he ever made such an appeal.

The Emperor Theodosius, doubtless influenced by his favourite Chrysaphius, the relative of Eutyches, wrote to S. Leo on his behalf. But the Pope in reply writes as something more than a mere patriarch when he reminds Theodosius that the matter must be dealt with by him, the pontiff himself, *ut in lucem ductis his quae adhuc videntur occulta, id quod evangelicae et apostolicae doctrinae convenit, judicetur.*[17]

Eutyches himself, too, wrote to the Pope, complained that he had been summoned to the council only because of the hatred of Eusebius of Dorylæum, not because of his faith; that he had offered the council his profession of faith and his writings, and the council had refused to read them; and that notwithstanding his appeal to the Pope, he had been excommunicated and deposed.

"I have recourse to you, you the defender of religion and

[14] Mansi, vi, 495.
[15] *Leo Ep.*, xx. Mansi, v, 1223.
[16] Mansi, vi, 817.
[17] *Leo Ep.*, 24, Ballerini.

the enemy of factions . . . and I ask you that, without regarding what has been intrigued against me, you will pronounce on the faith what you judge fit. Do not allow intriguers to pursue me with their calumnies, do not allow them to exclude from the number of Catholics him who has lived seventy years in continence and chastity."[18]

The Pope was surprised that he had not been informed of all this by Flavian. The perusal of the documents that Eutyches sent satisfied him of the justice of the condemnation itself, but he wrote to know why the canonical forms apparently had not been followed.[19]

As a matter of fact, Flavian, while he had sent notification of the deposition of Eutyches to the other bishops, *had sent to Leo the Acts of the Council themselves*. But somehow (some suggest by design of the Eutychian party) the documents had miscarried and had not yet arrived. Leo wrote to the Emperor Theodosius and complained that he had not heard from Flavian. It was necessary "*ut possit congrue de bene cognitis judicari*" and he had expected to receive the Acts "*cum studere debuerit primitus nobis cuncta reserare.*"[20] And to Flavian Leo wrote, blaming him for his apparent negligence, and telling him to send him full information of all the proceedings and "*usque ad nostram notitiam cuncta deferri.*"[21]

Flavian hastened to reply to the Pope. His reply is of the utmost significance. There is no questioning of the right of interference or of the superiority of Leo. Flavian writes with the fullest deference. He is quite willing to accept the reproofs if the letters had not been sent to the Pope. *Evidently he is averse from a General Council, he sees no need for one. In his opinion the judgment of the Pope is quite sufficient to put an end once for all, to the dispute.* And one takes it that he expresses the mind of the other Oriental bishops. He asks Leo to deign to give his decision in accordance with the canonical sentence pronounced in his council at Constantinople. It is significant, too, that he uses the word (στηρίξαι) confirm, in his request to Leo to confirm the faith of the emperor—the very word Christ uses in giving his injunction to Peter: "When thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren." (S. Luke xxii, 32).

"Your Wisdom will restore everywhere tranquillity and peace. Your revered letters will, with God's help, make to

[18] Mansi, v, 1014.
[19] Mansi, v, 1238.
[20] Leo *Ep.* 23, Ball.
[21] Mansi, v, 1238.

cease the heresy which has just arisen and the confusion which is its consequence ; and you will stop the assembling of the synod of which there are rumours, and which would throw the trouble into the churches of the whole world."[22]

Leo briefly acknowledged and praised Flavian's letter and informed him that he would be sending later another letter in which he would treat at length the Catholic doctrine on the questions which had arisen.

This will be the famous " Letter to Flavian," which we oftener know as the " Tome of Leo."

Eutyches also wrote to S. Peter Chrysologus, Archbishop of Ravenna, who, though born at Imola, was a Greek.[23] Peter Chrysologus, grieved by "these sad letters," though unable to judge the question without hearing the two parties, gave Eutyches this advice, which, at any rate, shows *his* conception of the powers of the see of Rome :

" Above all, we exhort you, honourable brother, to submit yourself in all things to what has been written by the blessed Pope of Rome, *because that Saint Peter, who lives and presides in his see, gives the faith to those who seek it.*

" As for us, the interest of peace and of the faith *prevents* us from listening to the discussions regarding dogma *without the consent of the Bishop of Rome.*"[24]

At this stage appears the famous Tome of the great Leo.[25]

The Pope still charitably thought that Eutyches was simply the victim of his own ignorance, foolishness, and obstinacy ; and that if the bearing of things were made clear to him, nothing would remain but to rehabilitate him as he hoped. And so Leo pens his celebrated treatise, which later he will send by his legates to the Archbishop of Constantinople—that treatise which has ever since been held in the highest veneration as one of the charters of the Church.

And now, like Nestorius, Eutyches appeals, or affects to appeal, to a General Council.

We have seen that, in the view of Flavian as well as Leo, a council was unnecessary. While Theodoret wrote to Domnus of Antioch :

" The news that we have recently received from your

[22] *Ep.*, xxvi.

[23] *"Pierre Chrysologue, quoique grec et écrivant à un grec, était cependant évêque de Ravenne et partant à moitié occidental."* Soloviev, *Op. cit.*, p. 183.

[24] Mansi, v, 1250.

[25] See Soloviev, p. 196, for the legend recorded by Sophronius, Patriarch of Jerusalem regarding the Tome.

> Holiness is for us a cause of great sadness; for one cannot say anything good of the synod which is in preparation, unless the loving God still show His goodness in bringing to naught the machinations of these unruly demons.[26]

However, the partisans of Eutyches pressed for a council. Chrysaphius wrote to the Empress Eudocia to gain her support, while Dioscorus of Alexandria was only too glad to be appealed to, for with his pugnacious and ambitious disposition, the controversy afforded him one more step towards the realisation of his desire—the supremacy over the Churches of the East. He was all for a General Council, and Theodosius—now that the influence of his wonderful sister Pulcheria was removed—was easy to gain to the same end.[27]

The holding of a council then having been decided upon, Leo, *though thinking it unnecessary, judged it profitable to utilise it* for setting forth the Catholic doctrine, especially as the affair had now grown to such vast proportions and was so widespread.

It was a triumph for Eutyches that the Emperor had nominated the "Eutychian" (to anticipate a term), Dioscorus, Patriarch of Alexandria, as the president—to be the judge, this time of the case of Eutyches.

The Emperor made an innovation in admitting to the council

[26] Theodoret *Ep.*, cxii.

[27] One may or may not agree entirely with a French writer about the calling of this council. "Il était en effet irrégulier, *bien que l'histoire offre plusieurs exemples de ce fait qu'un concile général fut convoqué par l'empereur. Théodose comprit du moins que ses actes seraient absolument nuls s'il n'était point en communion avec le pape, et il eut le souci de s'assurer l'adhésion de celui-ci; mais il semble avoir désiré en même temps que sa puissante et salutaire influence s'y fît sentir le moins possible.*"—Adolphe Regnier, *S. Léon le Grand*, p. 53. On this we may remark that we shall see the legates at Chalcedon demand the deposition of Dioscorus on the ground (among others) that he σύνοδον ἐτόλμησε ποιῆσαι ἐπιτροπῆς δίχα τοῦ ἀποστολικοῦ θρόνου (Mansi, vi, 581). But Leo at first had recognised the council and approved of its summoning, or he could not have sent legates. What, therefore, the legates at Chalcedon must mean is that he had thrust their predecessors at Ephesus (Latrocinium) into the background, ignored them and taken sole control himself. cf. V. Grumel in *Echos d'Orient*, p. 420 (1925). *Qui préside au IIe Concile d'Ephèse* (449)? *Apparémment Dioscore qui dirige l'action de l'assemblée. Les légats du pape qui sont présents, ne s'élèvent point contre cela, et la protestation indignée retentit seulement quand est rendu la sentence inique qui condamne Flavien. Cette présidence de Dioscore est de plus attestée par un passage d'une lettre de saint Léon à Théodose II où ce pape dit avoir appris du diacre Hilaire qu'un grand nombre d'évêques étaient allés au concile, et déclare qu'on pouvait en attendre un heureux résultat, si* is qui sibi locum principem vindicabat, sacerdotalem moderationem custodire voluisset. (*P. L.*, liv, 827.) *Cela signifie clairement que Dioscore a présidé le concile sans délégation, et que son vrai tort n'est pas là, mais dans la violence faite aux évêques et dans l'inique condemnation de Flavien. Le concile, en effet, aurait été bon et légitime sans l'injustice qui le fit achever en brigandage.*

an archimandrite, Barsumas, as representative of the monks, and this was the more outrageous, in that Barsumas was one of the leading Monophysites, while, on the other hand, care was taken to exclude Theodoret and Ibas, who, they not altogether unfairly believed, were infected with Nestorianism.[28]

Leo himself was asked to attend. But apart from its being contrary to custom for the pope to be present, he explains to the Empress Pulcheria[29] that the difficult times in Rome (the Huns were in fact threatening Italy) demanded his presence at home.

He now sends by his own messengers the famous Tome to the Archbishop Flavian. He reviews the controversy and metes out a certain amount of criticism to the synod at which Eutyches was condemned. He is astonished that the indignation of the judges has not been aroused by the absurd, perverse, foolish, and blasphemous affirmation of Eutyches: "I confess that our Lord had two Natures before the Union, but after the Union I confess only one Nature."

However, S. Leo still hopes for the repentance of Eutyches, and shows how he, if penitent, may be reconciled to the Church.

As envoys for this great matter he despatches Julius, Bishop of Pozzuoli, the priest Renatus (who dies on the journey), the deacon Hilary and the notary Dulcitius. "*In his fratribus meis quos vice mea misi, me quoque adesse cum ceteris qui adfuerint, aestimate,*" he writes to Pulcheria.[30] And to Julian, Bishop of Cos, he describes them as "*quos ex latere meo vice mea misi.*"[31] Leo was particularly devoted to Julian, Bishop of Cos,[32] and to him Leo wrote that he had sent letters to Flavian, "from which your beloved self and the whole Church may know about the ancient and only Faith, what we hold and preach as of divine tradition."

And so we arrive at the council which misses its purposes, degenerates, and becomes the "Robber-Council."[33]

This council—the Latrocinium (a name given to it by Leo himself, which has ever clung to it)—met on August 8, 449.

[28] See below re "the Three Chapters."

[29] *Ep.*, xxxi.

[30] *Ep.*, xxxi.

[31] *Ep.* xxxiv. Harnack says: "The council is merely an *opus superadditum* '*ut pleniori judicio omnis possit error aboleri.*' Thus the condemnation of Eutyches is already decided upon, and the council merely repeats it. The pope enjoins this."—*Hist. of Dogma*, iv, 203.

[32] Robertson, *Hist. Chr. Ch.*, vol. ii, pp. 242–3.

[33] Soloviev, *Op. cit.*, pp. 188–193, for striking comment on the Latrocinium.

Dioscorus dominated it in every direction. The Roman legates were practically ignored, the papal letter unread. One can see throughout the proceedings that Dioscorus' great motive is the jealousy of the see of Alexandria towards upstart Constantinople, and feel the influence of the Third Canon of the council of 381.

When Eutyches was called and spoke in his own justification, he was not altogether without reason when he complained that he had been condemned by Flavian's *συνόδος ἐνδημοῦσα* and not by a council convoked to deal with heresy. Dioscorus acceded to the request that the Acts of that council condemning Eutyches should be read, but he took steps to shelve the reading of Leo's letter, in spite of the request of the legate Julius.[34] The terrorised bishops anathematised the accusation that Eusebius of Dorylæum had made at Constantinople against Eutyches, and the latter asserted that Flavian had " doctored " the Acts of the synod, while Flavian, with hot indignation, denied the charge. In the end it was decided that Eutyches should be restored to his priesthood and his archimandriteship, and Dioscorus signed *οἰκουμενικῆς συνόδου ψήφους*, for he affected to call it an œcumenical council.[35]

But now came the culminating point of the struggle. Under pretext that Flavian had offended against the ruling of the Council of Ephesus (431), that nothing was to be added to the Nicene Creed, and that bishops who were guilty of the charge were to be deposed, Dioscorus demanded the deposition of Flavian and Eusebius of Dorylæum.

" *παραιτοῦμαι σε*, *appello a te*," exclaimed Flavian. And " *κοντραδίκιτουρ contradicitur*," cried the papal legate Hilary.[36] Then Flavian placed in the hands of the papal legates an appeal to the Pope.

Flavian's appeal is not mentioned in the naturally prejudiced Acts of the Robber Council, but it is vouched for in letters to Leo, Valentinian, and Placidia.[37]

Flavian gives an account of the proceedings at the Robber Synod. He tells Leo that Dioscorus would not permit

[34] Mansi, vi, 649.

[35] Soloviev, pp. 188–9.

[36] Mansi, vi, 908.

[37] Mansi, vi, 7, 49, 52. The text of the appeals which Flavian and Eusebius addressed personally to the Pope S. Leo has only been known since 1882. They were first published by M. Amelli and then by Mommsen (*Neues Archiv.*, xi, 362). See Adolphe Regnier, *S. Léon le Grand*, p. 79. Dom Ambrogio Amelli, Prior of the Archives of Monte Cassino, discovered in the archives of Novara a Latin rendering of the appeals. See also Grisar, *Hist. de Rome et des Papes*, i, 326.

" the epistle of Your Holiness to be read *though it is sufficient for the confirmation of the Faith of the Fathers,*"

and that an unjust sentence had been pronounced against him.

" I appealed to the throne of the Apostolic See of Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, and the universal blessed synod" (he means here the Roman consultative synod) " which is under Your Holiness."

He describes the disgraceful and unedifying scenes, the indignities and cruelties to which he was subjected, and then begs the Pope to confirm the Faith and to " teach the Emperor " and to write to all the principal participants in the affair (whom he names) Dioscorus included.

He urges Leo " to issue a decree—[38]

which God will inform your mind to frame, so that a Council of both East and West being held, a like faith may be everywhere preached, so that the statutes of the Fathers may prevail, that all that has been done may be rendered void . . . . and to apply healing to this horrible wound, which has spread serpent-like almost through the whole world."

What happened to the legate is unknown. Hilary escaped with his life, but before he could reach Rome to report to the Pope Flavian was dead. He passed away but three days after the Robber Council, a martyr for the Catholic Faith—a victim of the outrageous brutality and wounds of Dioscorus' minions—an exile in Lydia.[39]

Eusebius of Dorylæum, likewise condemned, makes his appeal for redress to Leo :

" *The Apostolic Throne* has been wont from the beginning to defend those who are suffering injustice. . . . You have a right understanding, and preserve the faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ unshaken, and exercise charity without dissembling towards all the brethren and all who call on the name of Christ. . . . I intreat Your Blessedness . . . give me back the dignity of my episcopate, and communion with

[38] *Dare formam.*

[39] "*Les meurtriers du patriarche de Constantinople,*" writes the Orthodox Soloviev, " *n'osèrent pas toucher au diacre de l'église romaine, et dans l'espace de deux années seulement le 'contradicitur' romain changea 'le très saint concile œcuménique d'Ephèse' en 'brigandage d'Ephèse,' fit déposer l'assassin mitré, valut à la victime la canonisation et amena la réunion, sous la présidence des légats romains, du vrai concile œcuménique de Chalcédoine.*"—*La Russie et l'Eglise Universelle,* p. 193. See also *Saint Léon le Grand,* by A. Regnier, p. 79.

yourself, by letters from you to my lowliness bestowing on me my rank and communion."

Theodoret and Domnus of Antioch and Ibas, too, fell under the displeasure of the Robber Synod, and were deposed.

Theodoret's See was left vacant, but Domnus was succeeded by Maximus, and Ibas by Nonnus.

If one compares the two Councils of Ephesus—the true one and the false one, the Œcumenical Council and the Robber Synod—the authority of the Roman pontiff, it has been well pointed out, is shown in a very striking manner.

Because S. Cyril, after sending to Rome a Latin translation of fragments of Nestorius, had obtained a " blank signature " from Pope Celestine, all the Church without exception received the first Council of Ephesus.

Because Dioscorus, at the second Council of Ephesus, was found in disagreement with Leo the Great (apart from other considerations) all the bishops at Chalcedon, with the sole exception of Dioscorus, condemned the second Council of Ephesus.[40]

A little later Theodoret appeals to the Pope.

The Greek Church has canonised Theodoret, the Bishop of Cyrrhus. This is how he addresses S. Leo :

" If S. Paul, the herald of the herald of the Truth, the trumpet of the Holy Spirit, ran to Peter for answer to the doubts of the Christians of Antioch on legal observances, it is far more right that we, the humble and little ones, should have recourse to Your Apostolic Throne, to receive from you the remedy for the wounds of the Churches. For on all accounts the Primacy fitly belongs to you, Your See is adorned with numerous excellencies. Other towns boast their greatness, their beauty, the number of their inhabitants, other towns lacking these advantages are adorned with certain spiritual privileges. Yours has received from God the fullness of blessing, it is the largest and the most illustrious, it presides over the universe, it overflows with inhabitants ; but what adorns it still more is its faith, which the divine Apostle worthily attests when he cries ' Your faith is proclaimed in all the world.' If immediately after having received the seeds of the salutary preaching, it produced such marvellous fruits, what discourse can celebrate as is meet the religion which reigns there to-day ? It possesses also

[40] See F. Nau, *Nestorius d'après les Sources Orientales* (Paris, 1911), p. 36. cf. Hefele, i, p. 3. Soloviev, p. 184, " *Le ' brigandage d'Ephèse ' venait de leur montrer* ad oculos *ce que pouvait être un concile œcuménique sans le pape.*"

the tombs of the fathers and common masters of the Truth, Peter and Paul, enlightening the souls of the faithful. This pair Divine and thrice-blessed appeared in the East and shed their rays on every side, but it is the West which they chose for deliverance from life and from there now that they illumine the Universe."[41]

Again he writes :

" These Apostles SS. Peter and Paul have rendered your throne most illustrious. This is the culminating point of your privileges. Further, their God has even now shed light on their throne, by placing in it Your Holiness (who is) shedding forth the rays of orthodoxy."

Evidently, by his quotation of Rom. i, 8, like other Fathers, Theodoret understands the words of S. Paul to the Church of Rome—the possession and holding on to the Faith—as *a special and abiding fact.*

Having dealt with the scandalous events at Ephesus, he continues :

" Twenty-six years I have been bishop without having received any reproach. . . I have brought back to the Church more than a thousand Marcionites and numerous Arians and Eunomaeans. There does not remain a heretic in the 800 parishes that I rule. God knows how many stonings I have undergone and what combats I have waged in many a city of the East against the Pagans, the Jews, and every kind of heretic, and after so many sweats and labours, I have been condemned without being judged. But I await the sentence of Your Apostolic See, I pray, I beg Your Holiness, to whose just tribunal I make my appeal, to lend me your aid, to order me to go to give an account at it of my doctrine and to show that it is agreeable to that of the Apostles."

Then having specified his works, which he submits to the Apostolic See for examination, he continues :

" But above all I beg you to inform me whether or not I ought to acquiesce in this unjust deposition, for I await your sentence. If you tell me to abide by the sentence that has been given, I will bear it and will not importune any one, but will await the just judgment of God our Saviour."[42]

The letter which Theodoret wrote to the legate, the priest

[41] *P. G.*, lxxxiii, 1313. *Ep.*, 113.
[42] *Ep.*, 113. *P. G.*, lxxxiii, 1316.

Renatus, who, however died, before he left the country, made a similar request :

> " I beg your Holiness to influence the most holy Archbishop to use his Apostolic Power to order me to fly to his synod, for this most holy See has the leadership of the Churches which are throughout the world, for several reasons, of which the principal is that it has never been infected with any heresy. It has never been occupied by an enemy of the true Faith, but has preserved intact the Apostolic grace. Whatever You decide we shall acquiesce in it, convinced of your justice. We ask to be judged according to our writings, for we have composed more than thirty books."[43]

Parenthetically these points from the above quotations from Theodoret's writings may profitably be emphasised : This Greek Father teaches that Rome is *par excellence* the apostolic throne —because it is the see of S. Peter. And to S. Peter even S. Paul appealed. The cause of the praise which S. Paul gave to the Roman Church (Romans i, 8) Theodoret believed still inherent in that Church. It is to Rome as the see of the two apostles, and as the place of their tombs that he renders praise —not because of its imperial grandeur.

Theodoret apparently was not required to make the journey to Rome, but Leo restored his see to him, for in the Council of Chalcedon we shall see that demand was made for his membership " because the most holy Archbishop Leo has restored his episcopate."[44]

[43] *Ep.*, 116. *P. G.*, lxxxiii, 1324.

[44] Mansi, vi, 589 and 591. Prof. Glubokovsky writes (" Papal Rome and Orthodox East," in the *Christian East*, Nov., 1923) regarding this appeal of Theodoret : " He from time to time appealed to the Pope Leo I, who was no doubt quite sufficiently alive to his papal importance. Theodoret, in his appeals, submitted himself beforehand to papal decisions, and the Pope expressed them always in the most final language. It seemed to be the case that ' *Roma locuta est, causa finita est.*' Still the whole affair was submitted for re-examination at the Council of Chalcedon which, *alone, reinstated Theodoret.*" The words in my italics are most unfair, to say the least. It is, as Mgr. Batiffol who answers Prof. Glubokovsky's criticisms at length in the February 1924 number of the same publication says, " a manifest exaggeration." At the 8th session of Chalcedon Theodoret was required to anathematise Nestorius, which he did. Then the members declared that all doubt was removed with regard to the most God-loving Theodoret " since he has anathematised Nestorius before us and has been recognised by the most God-loving and most holy archbishop Leo of Old Rome . . . . it only remains for Your Piety to pronounce that Theodoret must recover his Church as the most holy Leo has judged." " *Les acclamations éclatent qui approuvent la proposition du bureau : Théodoret est digne de son siège ! Nombreuses années à l'archevêque Léon ! Après Dieu Léon a jugé ! Peut-on dire après cela que* ' the whole affair was

The deacon Hilary[45] had prevented his being forced to sign the Acts of the false Council of Ephesus by taking himself off after the first session. At length he reached Rome and reported all the doings to Leo. The latter urges Theodosius to call an œcumenical council in Italy, just as Flavian urged in his appeal, which was now in the hands of the Pope.

To the people of Constantinople the Pope writes, urging fidelity and obedience to their lawful bishop. He does not yet know that Flavian is dead. "As long as your bishop is living if any rash person dares to usurp his see, never will he be received into our communion, for just as we anathematised Nestorius, so we condemn by a similar anathema those who deny the reality of our flesh in Jesus Christ."[46]

To certain archimandrites of Constantinople he writes counselling loyalty to their lawful Bishop, Flavian, and willingness to suffer, if necessary, for the Catholic Faith.

Ignorant of the death of Flavian, he hastens to send him a message of encouragement and consolation and promises of aid.[47]

Theodosius, weak and headstrong though he often showed himself, as one gathers from Leo's words, was not altogether blameworthy for his inactivity. He was led astray by his *entourage*, though himself, as Leo said, orthodox enough.[48]

. . . . . .

A little time after, at the beginning of the year 450, Valentinian, the Emperor of the West, together with his wife, Eudoxia, and his mother, Galla Placidia, came to Rome from Ravenna to visit the Churches. It was on the Feast of S. Peter's Chair,

submitted for re-examination at the Council of Chalcedon, which alone reinstated Theodoret.' *C'est une exagération manifeste.*" Dr. Bright, like Prof. Glubokovsky, would make a good deal of controversial capital about this "restoration" of Theodoret by the Council of Chalcedon (see his *Roman See in the Early Church*, p. 194, and *Waymarks in Church History*, p. 231), where he wrongly asserts that Theodoret was "kept waiting through several sessions as one who was still open to accusation." "On Vaticanist principles," he remarks, the judgment of Pope Leo "should have been amply sufficient to place him as a matter of course among the constituent members of the Council of Chalcedon." The answer is that it did, and as speedily as possible. It was only because of the excited and noisy opposition of a small minority (see Batiffol *Art. cit.*), chiefly Egyptians, that there was delay, and Theodoret sat in the Council during the second Act (Mansi, vi, 943) and signed as "Bishop of Cyrrhus" at the end of the fourth Act. See also Soloviev, *Op. cit.*, p. 177.

[45] Afterwards Pope Hilary.

[46] Mansi, vi, 30.

[47] Mansi, vi, 29.

[48] *Ep.*, 50: "the faith in which we know the most Christian emperor remains firm."

February 22, that they arrived at S. Peter's to find the Pope, surrounded by a crowd of bishops, presiding over the solemnities of the day. Placidia herself describes the moving scene. The Pope, filled with emotion, descended from the altar to greet the sovereign.[49] He besought all of them to use their influence with Theodosius (Placidia with her nephew, Eudoxia with her father) to persuade him to remit the judgment of Flavian to the council and the Apostolic See, and that the council might take place in Italy.

The Empress Placidia speaks of the Appeal of Flavian

> " to the Apostolic See and all the bishops of these parts through the legates of the Bishop of Rome, who, according to the canons of the Nicene (Sardican) Council, are wont to be present."

She requested Theodosius, that

> " according to the decree and decision (*τὸν τὺπον καὶ τὸν ὅρον*) of the Apostolic Chair, which in like manner we venerate as at the head of matters (*ὡς προηγούμενον προσκυνοῦμεν*), the judgment to be referred to the synod of the apostolic throne, in which he who was counted worthy to receive the keys of heaven first adorned the episcopal rule (*ἐπισκοπὴν τῆς ἀρχιερωσύνης*)." And she added " It becomes us to guard the reverence due to this greatest of cities which is the mistress of the whole world."

To the Empress Pulcheria, Placidia also wrote that the question might be referred to

> " the apostolic throne, in which the most blessed of the apostles, Peter, who received the keys of heaven, first adorned the High Priesthood."
>
> " We ought," she said, " to give the precedence in all things to the Eternal City."[50]

[49] See Robertson, vol. ii, *Op. cit.*, p. 216.

[50] See *Ep.*, lv, lvi, lvii. Ballerini, i, 961, and Hefele, vol. iii, p. 266. Mansi, vi, 50, *seq.*

CHAPTER X

THE COUNCIL OF CHALCEDON (451). THE PAPACY AT CHALCEDON

THEODOSIUS was dead—killed by a stumbling horse. His death changed all the circumstances, for now Pulcheria, uncompromisingly orthodox, was Empress, and her like-minded consort, Marcian, was Emperor.

There was less need now to desire a council, or, if one did take place, to hold it in Italy, far removed from heretical court influence.

Anatolius of Alexandria, the secretary of Dioscorus, had been uncanonically thrust into the see of the martyred Archbishop Flavian. Dioscorus himself was the consecrator, and Eutyches assisted him.

Consider now Leo's dealings with Anatolius. They signify a good deal and illustrate very plainly what the relations between the Eastern Churches and the see of Rome really were. And there is no word of protest, no question of Leo's right of interference or dictation.

Anatolius had written to Leo to announce his consecration, and from Leo's letter to the Emperor it is patent that Anatolius wrote, as was customary, to obtain Leo's confirmation.[1]

But the Declaration of Faith, which it was customary to send at the same time, he omitted to despatch, and it is especially to be noted that Eutyches and his teaching had not been mentioned. And this is why Leo wrote to the Emperor asking the reason.[2] It shows that Leo, like Celestine before him, had a great idea of his own importance; and it shows equally that that great importance was recognised.[3] The Pope's legates, Abundius and Asterius, brought the letters to Constantinople. They learnt on their arrival of the death of Theodosius II, and delivered the papal letter to his successor, Marcian.

[1] See Robertson, *Op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 217.
[2] *Ep.*, lxix.
[3] See Soloviev, *Op. cit.*, chaps. xi and xii.

To make a long story short, Leo requires Anatolius to sign his Tome, Cyril's Second Letter to Nestorius, and the patristic passages inserted in the Acts of the Council of Ephesus.

And Pulcheria writes to Leo that " Anatolius embraces the Apostolical confession of Your letters," " the letter of the Catholic Faith."

In reply Leo congratulates Anatolius " that those who serve our God may rejoice that your peace has been concluded with the Apostolic See."

Marcian had already written to Leo to announce his accession, and now he wrote to ask the Pope to come to the East to preside at the ensuing council.[4] Leo, in his reply, congratulates the Emperor and Empress on their zeal and orthodoxy and for their piety in bringing the remains of the martyred Flavian to Constantinople with all due honour, but the misfortunes of the time, the menace of Attila from Gaul, make a council inopportune.[5] Besides, one may see, now that there was a Catholic emperor on the throne, and most had signed the Tome, the need for a council was less pressing A fresh examination of the Faith was somewhat superfluous.

Marcian, however, had already sent out invitations to the council, the convocation of the council being committed to the Pope, who, the Emperor hoped, would preside over it in person.

Though Leo did not approve of what seemed to him undue precipitancy, he would not stand in the way of a council, but would utilise this, as he had hoped to utilise the other Council, to proclaim the faith and help the unity of the Church. He was anxious that those who repented of their heresy should be restored, and that those who had been unjustly driven out should be re-instated.[6]

Nicæa had been the place proposed for the meeting, but Marcian, fearing trouble from an attack of the Barbarians in Illyria, judged it best to transfer the meeting-place to Chalcedon, opposite Constantinople. This would also allow him to exercise supervision and prevent the disorder of the Robber Synod.

The most numerously attended of all the councils, its members numbered something in the neighbourhood of six hundred.[7]

But again, it must be stressed, *it was practically entirely an Eastern Council.* With the exception of the papal legates and two African bishops, all the six hundred and thirty Fathers of

4 *Ep.*, lxxvi.
5 *Ep.*, lxxxiii.
6 *Ep.*, lxxxix–xc–xciv–xci, etc., but cf. Robertson, ii, pp. 217–219.
7 *Ep.*, cii, 2.

the Council of Chalcedon were Easterns.[8] The Council lasted from October 8 to November 1, 451.

The Pope appointed the president, Paschasinus, a Sicilian bishop. *Fratrem et coepiscopum meum Paschasinum de ea provincia, quae videtur esse securior, evocatum, qui vicem praesentiae meae possit implere, direxi*—he wrote to Marcian,[9] and with Paschasinus were associated as legates Lucentius, a bishop, and Boniface, a priest.

Paschasinus opened the proceedings. He spoke in the name of the Pope, " the most blessed and apostolic Bishop of the city of Rome, *who is Head of all the Churches*." He protested against the inclusion of Dioscorus among the members of the council and still more among the judges. " He has not the right to take part in the council, but only to come to defend himself." Either he left or they left.

When the Emperor's commissioners asked what the charge was, Lucentius, the other bishop-legate, replied: " Let him give an account of his own judgment, for he usurped the authority of judge and dared to hold a council without the authority of the Apostolic See, which never has been done and is not competent."[10] The result of this protest was that Dioscorus left his place at the *left hand*[11] of the legates, and went and sat in the middle—the place of the accused.

Eusebius of Dorylæum made his accusation, and Theodoret was admitted, in spite of the loud protestations of the Egyptians, and took his seat among the accusers.[12]

Dioscorus made a haughty but weak, ineffective defence.

The Creed of Nicæa, that of Constantinople, the letters of Cyril to Nestorius and to the Easterns, having been read, the Secretary Veronician at last read the famous Tome. The air was rent with tumultuous shouts as this proceeded :

> " It is the faith of the Apostles, it is the faith of the Fathers. Thus we all believe. . . . *Peter has spoken by the mouth of Leo*. . . Leo and Cyril have taught the same thing. . . Why was not that read at Ephesus ? See what Dioscorus hid ! "[13]

Then witnesses having been called to testify against the morals of Dioscorus as well as against his faith—one of the witnesses being the priest Athanasius, like Dioscorus himself, a

[8] See Hefele, vol. iii, p. 298.
[9] *Ep.*, lxxxix. Mansi, vi, 125. cf. Döllinger, *Op. cit.*, ii, 222.
[10] Mansi, vi, 645.
[11] The left was the place of honour.
[12] See above (p. 186) the footnote.
[13] Mansi, vi, 972.

nephew of Cyril—the president Paschasinus rose to give sentence. The Acts record :

" Paschasinus, Bishop of Lilybaeum, of the province of Sicily, and with him Lucentius, Bishop of Ascoli, and Boniface priest of the great Church of Rome, holding the place of the most holy and blessed Leo, patriarch of the Apostolic See of great and old Rome, pronounced these words :

" The excesses committed against the canons by Dioscorus, formerly Bishop of Alexandria, are made manifest, as well by the preceding sitting as by this. Arrogating to himself the primacy, he has irregularly received into communion Eutyches, regularly condemned by his own bishop. He persists in upholding what he did at Ephesus, for which he ought to beg pardon as the others to whom the Apostolic See has shown clemency. He did not permit the letter of Pope Leo to Flavian to be read, although he had been requested to do so several times and although he had promised it on oath, and in consequence caused scandals and wounds to the Church of God throughout the world. However we deliberated after all that, whether we should not use clemency towards him as towards the others who were less culpable, but he surpassed his first excesses by excesses greater still. He was so carried away as to pronounce a sentence of excommunication against Leo, the most holy Patriarch of Rome. Further, several complaints having been presented against him to the Council, he has been summoned thrice and has not chosen to obey ; he has therefore himself provoked the sentence, by his repeated contempt of the ecclesiastical Canons. *This is why the most holy and blessed Patriarch of great and old Rome, Leo, by us and by the Council here assembled, in union with the Apostle Saint Peter thrice blessed and worthy of all praise, who is the Rock which provides the base of the Catholic Church and the foundation of the true Faith, has deprived Dioscorus of the episcopal dignity and of all sacerdotal ministry.* Let the Council ordain therefore concerning him following the Canons."[14]

It cannot be without some significance that Boniface, a simple priest, signed the Acts with the two other legates first, before the Patriarch of Constantinople.

It was because he was one of the representatives of Leo.

It is a Russian Orthodox writer, the historian V. V. Bolotov, commenting on S. Leo and the Council of Chalcedon, who says : " *Totius Ecclesiæ princeps, primas. De toto mundo unus*

[14] Mansi, vi, 1048.

Petrus eligitur, qui omnibus Apostolis cunctisque Ecclesiæ Patribus praeponatur . . . . . Ce primatus, *ce* principatus *de l'Apôtre Pierre est une institution non pas temporaire, mais permanente. . . . Visiblement il gouverne l'église par ses successeurs. . . . La relation des évêques romains au chef des apôtres reproduit toujours de près, dans ses profondeurs et dans ses résultats, le* consortium potentiae *de Pierre avec le Christ. . . . Ainsi d'après Léon le Grand, tout l'édifice ecclésiastique reproduit la diversité des relations établies entre les Apôtres. Entre eux, à l'égalité d'élection, il n'y eut pas égalité d'autorité. De même les évêques, égaux entre eux par leur dignité sacerdotale, ne le sont ni par leurs droits canoniques, ni par leur participations au gouvernment de l'Eglise. . . . . Ce ministère sur toutes les Eglises incombe à l'évêque de Rome,* principaliter ex jure divino. . . *L'*episcopatus universalis *du Souverain Pontife de Rome, enseigné par Léon le Grand, n'exclut pas l'égalité hiérarchique, c'est à dire sacramentelle, de tous les évêques, mais seulement la* plenitudo potestatis. . . . *Jamais il ne peut devenir nécessaire de juger un évêque romain ; il peut avoir ses déficits, mais compensés et corrigés par les mérites de Pierre. Ainsi apparaît-il qu'un évêque romain ne saurait sérieusement faillir.*"[15]

But now has to be considered the XXVIIIth Canon of Chalcedon. It is this celebrated canon on which are essayed to be built the most weighty arguments against any special privilege of the see of Peter and its occupant. One must, however, bear in mind four facts :

1. There are ancient manuscripts which bear the signatures of the legates after the first twenty-seven canons.
2. When the archdeacon Aetius brought forward the question of the privileges of the Church of Constantinople, the legates said that that question was not one which came in the terms of their commission, and withdrew, and the " Senate " did the same ; and most of the Fathers had already left for home.
3. Only 84 signed this XXVIIIth canon, although the membership of the Council was 630.

[15] D'Herbigny, *Theologica de Ecclesia*, vol. ii., p. 138.

Döllinger, *Op. cit.*, ii, 223, " The Emperor Marcian requested the Pope Leo to confirm the Council of Chalcedon, that all doubt of his approbation of its transactions might be removed. The deacon Ferrandus asserted that it was by this confirmation that the Council first acquired its authority ; and in general he declared that œcumenical councils which had received the confirmation of the pope were in authority highest next to the sacred Scriptures."

4. The canon is really only concerned with the *patriarchal* position of Rome, not its primacy.[16]

The famous canon runs thus :

" The fathers rightly attribute to old Rome privileges which correspond to its political importance. And it is by a similar sentiment that the five hundred bishops have accorded to new Rome equal privileges, rightly judging that, having both the emperor and his senate, it ought to enjoy the same advantages, to have the same importance in ecclesiastical order and to keep in all things the second rank after old Rome."

" *Les rédacteurs de ce canon,*" writes the abbé Rohrbacher, " *parlent et raisonnent non pas en pères de l'Eglise, en docteurs chrétiens, mais en sophistes grecs ; au lieu de s'appuyer sur la parole de Jésus-Christ, ils arguent de considérations politiques pour sécullariser en principe les églises d'Orient, et les asservir dans les siècles futurs au sultan de la Turquie et au sultan de la Russie.*"[17]

However, it seems to me that the *existence of the canon tells rather in favour of Roman " claims " than against, for it begins thus* : "We define first of all that the primacy (πρωτεῖα) and the eminent honour following the canons being safeguarded for the most holy Archbishop of ancient Rome, it is also necessary that the most holy Archbishop of the Imperial City, new Rome, Constantinople, enjoy the same privileges of honour " (note there is no mention of primacy) "and receive authoritatively the power to ordain the metropolitans of Asia, of Pontus and of Thrace." The opposition of the legates to the canon is simply because it threatens the honour belonging by ancient Conciliar enactment to Alexandria and Antioch. The canon does not deny the primacy of Rome. *On the contrary, it formally recognises it.*

Anatolius, the Patriarch of Constantinople, was plainly behind this XXVIIIth Canon. He had now forgotten Alexandria and had thoroughly adapted himself to the atmosphere of Constantinople.

[16] Milman, *Hist. of Lat. Christy.*, Book II, chap. v, says : " This canon, it is averred, was passed by a few bishops who lingered behind the rest of the Council ; it claims only the subscription of a hundred and fifty (*sic*) prelates, and those chiefly of the diocese of Constantinople. It is not, indeed, likely that the Alexandrian Church, though depressed by the ignominious degradation of its head, still less that the more ancient Churches of Antioch and Jerusalem, should thus tamely acquiesce in the assumption of superiority (unless it were in a measure enforced by the imperial power) by the modern and un-apostolic Church of Byzantium." cf. Soloviev, *Op. cit.*, xxxviii, *seq.*

[17] *Hist. Universelle de l'Eglise*, viii, p. 264.

One might debate: "Who are meant by the 'Fathers?'" Was it the members of the council of 381? This is how many explain the word—but this point is more conveniently dealt with later.

Meanwhile, it is to be remembered the IIIrd Canon of Constantinople had never been recognised by Rome.[18]

The Council of Nicæa did not pretend to grant the first rank to Rome. *It found it an established fact.* And, as our examination has shown all along, it is always because Rome is the see of Peter that the popes assert their superiority, and it is pure assumption and assertion, and it is absolutely unhistorical to say that the "Fathers" GAVE Rome the primacy. *They recognised it there.* And they recognised it because, and solely because, it was the see of Peter. Ἀποδίδωμι does *not* mean "I give as a present," but "I return a gift," or "I render a due."[19] When Anthimus VII, in his encyclical of 1895, asserts Οὐδέποτε ὁ Ἐπίσκοπος Ῥώμης ἐθεωρήθη ὡς ἡ ἀνωτάτη ἀρχὴ καὶ ἀλάνθαστος κεφαλὴ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας, the history of the Council of Chalcedon, and in fact of all the preceding, justifies a recent writer in replying: "*Talisne semper ecclesiarum harum fuit doctrina? Nequaquam, sed et ecclesia Constantinopolitana, quae alias peperit ecclesias dissidentes, olim de S. Petro, ejusque successoribus, cum ecclesia Romana, unam quippe cum ea ecclesiam constituebat, idem credidit et docuit. Passiones humanae, non revelatio divina, saec. IX et subsequentibus, novam de ecclesiae Christi constitutione genuerunt doctrinam.*"[20]

We have already seen that the ambitious movement began when Byzantium became Constantinople.

It seemed to be rooted in the Eastern mind that the religious importance of a city must be commensurate with its political significance.[21] No doubt there is something to be said for it. For it would be held by the most ardent papalist that it was Providence and prudence which led Peter to establish himself at Rome. But, as Leo wrote, "One must not confound divine things with secular, and no institution will be lasting if it is not built on the Rock which Our Lord has laid as foundation."[22]

The IIIrd Canon of Constantinople had never been recognised by Rome.[23] But this XXVIIIth Canon of Chalcedon was an

[18] See above, p. 138.
[19] Dom J. Chapman, *Bishop Gore and the Catholic Claims*, p. 86. Our Lord uses the same word in "*Render* unto Caesar," etc.
[20] *Primatus Pont. Rom. in Concil. Chalced.* T. Harapin (1923), p. 5. (*Ad Claras Aquas*, 1923).
[21] See *Epistle of Gelasius*, p. 216.
[22] *Ep.*, civ, 3.
[23] See Leo *Ep.*, cvi, s.

advance on that. It was one more step on the march to equality with Rome.

The circumstances were such as Anatolius and his followers would be likely to take advantage of. There was that σύνοδος ἐνδημοῦσα of which Duchesne has stressed the importance, which was always a powerful instrument in the hands of ambitious patriarchs—the city was always full of bishops from various parts.

Then the great see of Alexandria—the second in Christendom—was vacant, while Antioch, it will be recalled, was now filled by one of Anatolius' party, consecrated by him and irregularly intruded. Constantinople's ambition would meet little opposition, therefore, and her attempting to carry out her scheme of hegemony over Asia, Pontus and Thrace, could hardly be more opportune. Juvenal of Jerusalem, too, was squared or silenced, because he at last had succeeded in gaining three of the coveted provinces of Antioch under his rule.

From Anatolius' point of view, circumstances could hardly have been more favourable, for of the members of the council about two thirds had already taken their departure.

When the legates heard what had passed in this 15th session they demanded another. Paschasinus laid his complaint, and the excuse Aetius the archdeacon made, was, that after the important business of a council was finished they were accustomed to discuss things of lesser importance. The legates had absented themselves—they therefore had to transact their business in their absence.

Lucentius, the legate, asked: "If, then, the bishops of Constantinople have enjoyed this privilege so long, what are they asking for at present? If they have never enjoyed it, why do they demand it?"[24]

No answer was forthcoming to this very logical reasoning, but Aetius asked the legates to show the papal order. And they did. It read:

> "Do not allow anyone to infringe in anything the ordinance of the holy fathers (*sc.* Nicæa). Protect on every occasion the dignity of our Person which you represent. And if any people, trusting to the glory of their cities, wish to usurp anything, resist them with all necessary resolution."

Paschasinus, asked by the imperial officers to show the canons on which he relied, read the VIth Canon of Nicæa:

[24] See Mansi, vii, 442, marginal note and cf. Hefele, iii, p. 428.

" The Church of Rome has always had the primacy."[25] [These VIth and VIIth Canons confirmed the privileges of Rome, Alexandria and Antioch, and the rights of metropolitans. To Jerusalem was given a special place of honour but not of jurisdiction.]

The legates make a strong protest : "The Apostolic See ought not to be humiliated in our presence. That is why we beg you to annul the measures which were taken yesterday in our absence against the ordinances of the canons. For want of which we ask that our opposition be inserted in these Acts. We shall know then what we must report to him who is the pope of the Universal Church, and he it is who himself will judge of the injury done to his see and of the overthrow of the canons."

"*These members of this fragmentary council desire, however, the pope's acceptance and approval of their canon.*"

And the terms of the letter they send to Leo *must* be borne in mind when one is assessing the value and content of their canon.

They address the pope as "*the constituted interpreter to all of blessed Peter,*" "*the Head of the members,*" as "*entrusted by Our Saviour with the Guardianship of the Vine.*"

They feel sure that he will " extend his wonted care to the Church of Constantinople and enlighten it with his Apostolic ray." And they conclude " Honour, then, we pray you, our judgment, with Your decree, that as we have been united to *our Head*[26] in agreeing upon what was right, *so the Head may confirm the becoming act of the children.*"

It is *patriarchal* rank that Constantinople is concerned about, not primacy (πρωτεῖα).

But Leo is determined to stand by the canons of Nicæa and not allow Alexandria and Antioch to be displaced and depressed. They get no confirmation of their abortive canon from Rome.

[25] I have already referred to these words as the alleged introduction of the canons, see p. 79.

[26] Dr. Bright, *Roman See in Early Church*, p. 205, says they call Leo their " Head," " because by his legates he was their president." But it is plain that he was president *because he was the head of the Church*, as indeed he had been called by the legates at the opening of the council. And the words of the bishops in their letter to Leo show quite plainly that he presided as being head of the members because of his position in the Universal Church. ὧν σὺ μὲν ὡς κεφαλὴ μελῶν ἡγεμόνευες, i.e. whom you, as head of the members, were presiding over, in those who held your place. The Council had been called as the Emperor Marcian said, σοῦ αὐθεντοῦντος (Leo *Ep.*, 63, cf. *Ep.* 77 σοῦ αὐθεντοῦντος ὁρίσωσιν, Pulcheria's words of its object.) The criticism on the part of Dr. Bright seems to me very feeble and captious.

On the contrary, uncompromising opposition. In their synodal letter to Leo they rather cut the ground from under their own feet when of their proposal they twice say, "*A Tua Sanctitate non inchoata*" while asking the Pope's βεβαίωσίν τε καὶ συγκατάθεσιν. The emperor Marcian had supported their request. To him as to Anatolius, Leo replies with the utmost intransigence. He tells the Emperor that his royal presence is not enough to make a see Apostolic. And the Emperor himself replies:

> "Your Holiness has excellently acted as bishop of the Apostolic See when it has in no way allowed any innovation against discipline."[27]

To the Empress Pulcheria the Pope wrote in the most authoritative and peremptory fashion regarding the East in general: "As for the resolution of the bishops which is contrary to the Nicene decree, *I declare it to be invalid and annul it by the authority of the holy Apostle Peter.*"[28]

As for Anatolius, his reply to the Pope can only be described as cringing.

> "I will obediently execute all that you have commanded."

And as for Canon XXVIII, he pleads that all its value depended on the confirmation and sanction of the authority of His Holiness.

Prof. d'Herbigny quotes the Orthodox Russian writer, A. Pavlov, who discovered a Slav MS. of the twelfth century and published the text in the Vizantiiskii Vremennik of 1897 (*t.* iv, pp. 150-2) which gives an account of the answer of S. Methodius, the Byzantine apostle of the Slavs, about this XXVIIIth Canon:

> "It is necessary to know that this decision was not accepted by the blessed Pope Leo. . . . And it is not true, as this canon affirms, that the holy fathers have accorded the primacy and honour to old Rome because it was the capital of the empire. But it is from on high that it began, it is of grace divine that this primacy has derived its origin. Peter, the most exalted of the apostles, heard from the mouth of our Lord these words (Matt. xvi. 17). This is why he possesses among the hierarchs pre-eminent rank and the first see. It is notorious, besides, that, although emperors have dwelt at Milan and Ravenna, and that their palaces are found there to our own day, these cities have not received on that account the primacy. For the dignity and the pre-eminence of the priestly hierarchy have not been established by the favour of the civil power, but by Divine choice and by apos-

[27] *Ep.*, 110. [28] *Ep.*, 105.

tolic authority. . . . How would it be possible, because of an earthly emperor, to displace divine gifts and apostolic privileges and to introduce innovations into the prescriptions of the immaculate faith. Immovable, indeed, unto the end are the privileges of old Rome. So, in so far as being set over all the Churches, the Pontiff of Rome has no need to betake himself to all the holy œcumenical councils, but without his participation manifested by the sending of some of his subordinates, every œcumenical council is non-existent and it is he who renders legal everything that has been decided in the council."

Methodius, the writer, is a Byzantine, and he concludes :

" If there is anyone who appears opposed to what we say, let him examine well what the same most holy Pope Leo wrote to Marcian and Pulcheria of pious memory, what he wrote also to the Bishop of Constantinople, the above-named Anatolius, and he will be convinced of the truth of these things."

To emphasise a point which has already been raised, impartial examination of this *celebrated XXVIIIth Canon of Chalcedon* and its circumstances (and it is impossible to avoid the field of controversy) shows that instead of depreciating papal claims it supports them. " The Fathers rightly rendered the primacy to Elder Rome because it was the imperial city." οἱ πατέρες εἰκότως ἀποδεδώκασι τὰ πρεσβεῖα.[29] But if this means that the Fathers gave the primacy to Rome—and that without this granting Rome would not have had a primacy—and that they gave it simply because it was the imperial city—that is to say that its position was based simply upon ecclesiastical consent —if this was really the belief of these bishops at Chalcedon, how could they possibly have asked Leo to confirm their canon, I mean, while at the very same time telling him that he was " the Guardian of the Vine," the Head of the members," " the Constituted Interpreter to all of Blessed Peter "? It is inconceivable. It would put the Easterns in a most unpleasant light. It would be the most unheard-of duplicity, and worse.

No doubt there was a certain party in the East growing more and more jealous of old Rome, more and more ambitious for the new. They might be willing to use subterfuge, but they would be in a minority.

But the Headship of Rome is shown and confessed in the very act of the bishops of this fragment of a council trying to obtain Leo's confirmation of their canon. He is κεφαλὴ (*caput*)

[29] The use of the same word in the Gospel, " *Render* unto Caesar," etc.

the κορυφὴ (*summitas*). And if their words mean anything, they say at the very same time that his position was of Divine Right.

Leo was simply concerned for the position of Alexandria and Antioch. And yet he (who, according to some modern writers, is the first great assertor of the Petrine claims) never even suspects that this canon is combating the Roman claims! It is impossible that he should not see it, if such were the case! *The canon is not concerned with the primacy.* The canon is concerned with Constantinople getting the second place—as they say, "*post vestram sanctissimam et apostolicam sedem primatum habere Constantinopilitanam sedem, quae secunda est ordinata.*" And when they write to the Emperor Marcian to support the council they speak of them τῆς Πέτρου καθέδρας βεβαιοῦντες τὸ κήρυγμα. The question as to who the "Fathers" are of whom the canon speaks is frequently answered by saying that it is the bishops at Nicæa or Constantinople. But it has been already shown that the history manifests the primacy recognised from the latter part of the first century. The bishops at Nicæa and Constantinople recognise it as already there. It is unhistorical to say that the primacy was the work of the fathers of Nicæa. Eleven years before, at Arles, it had been recognised.

The obvious meaning of "the Fathers" (as is seen in other cases) is the apostles and their successors and the recognised leaders of the Church.

A most interesting thesis is put forward by a writer in the *Dublin Review* for 1903.[30] It is that "the Fathers" are especially, though not exclusively, Peter and Paul, and he bases his argument on the fact that not long previously, Pope Leo, in a sermon on the Feast of Peter and Paul, had practically anticipated the words of the canon. "Blessed Peter, the Prince of the Apostolic Order received for his lot the citadel of the Roman empire (*arcem Romani imperii*) that the light of the Faith, which was being revealed for the salvation of all nations, might be shed more efficaciously through the whole body of the world from its head" (*efficacius se ab ipso capite per totum mundi corpus effunderet*).

Leo contrasts their true *patres* Peter and Paul, with Romulus and Remus the *patres* of secular Rome. "These are they who have raised thee to this glory (*qui te ad hanc gloriam provexerunt*) that being made by the Holy See of Blessed Peter the head of the world as a holy nation, an elect people, a sacerdotal and royal city, thou mightest rule more

[30] Art. "The Fathers gave Rome the Primacy," by A. Westall.

widely by divine religion than with an earthly sway. For though, increased by many victories, thou hast extended thy empire by land and sea, nevertheless it is a smaller realm that the toil of war has subdued to thee than that which has been made thy subject by the Christian peace."

When, then, the eighty-three bishops sent to him for his confirmation their XXVIIIth Canon, saying things precisely similar to his own words concerning Rome, *he never for one moment saw in their words an attack on his primacy. And he must have seen it if it had been there.* He must have vigorously protested —he, the first great assertor (we are told, though wrongly) of the papal prerogatives. But he does not ; all his opposition was against the depression of Alexandria and Antioch. It is, to repeat, *patriarchal* rank only that is in question.[31]

. . . . .

In concluding this brief examination of the Council of Chalcedon I would make a few further observations : the primacy which is manifested here is anything but a mere " primacy of honour." It is a primacy for which " supremacy" would be a juster synonym and equivalent—it is a primacy with active " jurisdiction." Just as at Ephesus Celestine prescribed the judgment, so here it is Leo's Tome which is proposed to the Fathers at Chalcedon for their acceptance and ratification. The object of the council is that the doctrine already defined by the pope may be " confirmed " and justified before the world. It is that the bishops may manifest to all that they are in agreement with the doctrine contained in the Tome.[32]

[31] The XXVIIIth Canon was for the Universal Church a dead letter, though of course Constantinople did not forget it and went on with its ambition. cf. Rev. A. C. Hall, *Leadership not Lordship*, p. 40 (Kegan Paul, 1892). " The primacy is of our Lord's appointment, it resides in Rome because Rome was chosen for S. Peter's fixed and final see. The evidence of this is overwhelming. The only passage that I know of which can be quoted against it is the clause in the *abortive Canon XXVIII* of Chalcedon, that the Fathers gave the primacy to Rome because it was the imperial city ; but this sentence, *even if the canon were authoritative, which it is not, does not explain the primacy*, but only why Rome was chosen for its seat. I feel this is most important for anything like fair and respectful controversy with Rome." It is the Russian Orthodox writer Bolotov whom we have already cited, who writes :

> " By virtue of the primacy of Peter, the Bishop of Rome confirms the decision of councils, decides most often without councils, receives appeals from everywhere ; from which Roman decision there is no appeal." (Lektsii, *t.* iii, p. 303, quoted by d'Herbigny, *Op. cit.*, p. 22.)

[32] As Leo wrote to the Archimandrites, " Meanwhile let your love take care that what we preach contrary to the impious sense (*sc.* of Eutyches) and in accordance with evangelic doctrine, may be known to all the children of the Church. For although we wrote fully what had always been and was

They examined the Tome, it is true, but it was a private not a conciliar examination, and it was with the object of adding their weight to his, Leo being their guide.

And hence they address Leo thus :

> " *Quam veluti auro textam seriem* ex pracepto legislatoris venientem usque ad nos, ipse servasti, vocis beati Petri omnibus constitutus interpres *et ejus fidei beatificationem super omnes adducens. Unde et nos, quippe* ut inchoatore (ἀρχηγὸν) bonorum te ad utilitatem utentes, Ecclesiae filiis haereditatem sortemque veritatis ostendimus . . . . *et eramus in communi corona gaudii, quasi in imperialibus coenis, deliciis spiritualibus epulantes,* quas per tuas litteras Christus praeparaverat," etc.[33]

It must be remembered (as pointed out above p. 190) that most had already subscribed the Tome—before the council was convoked. So the object of the council was not to show that Leo agreed with them, but rather that they agreed with Leo. And can anyone fairly reading the documents maintain that the bishops at Chalcedon conceived of themselves as having the power to revise, reverse, or reject the Tome ?

Dr. W. Bright maintains that the bishops at Chalcedon " accept the Tome because they personally believe it to be conformable to Church standards, just as their predecessors had dealt with Cyril's letter, and thus by their act it acquires a place among Church standards."[34]

I am quite certain the documents show that Leo himself never dreamed of his letter becoming only thus a " Church standard "[35]—the possibility of the bishops sitting in judgment

the opinion of Catholics, still we have now added no little exhortation to confirm the minds of all. *For I am mindful that I preside over the Church in his name whose confession was praised by the Lord Jesus Christ* and whose faith destroys all heresies, but especially the impiety of the present error, and I understand that nothing else is permitted to me than that I should spend all my efforts on that cause in which the safety of the Universal Church is attacked."

[33] *Ep.*, 98.

[34] *Roman See in the Early Church*, p. 188. With this compare the Orthodox Soloviev, pp. 173–4, *Op. cit.*, and p. 176.

[35] cf. these words of Soloviev : " *Dans les écrits et les actes de Léon Ier ce n'est pas le germe de la papauté que nous voyons, c'est cette papauté elle-même qui se manifeste dans toute l'étendue de ses attributions. Pour ne mentionner que le point le plus important, quatorze siècles avant Pie IX la doctrine de l'infallibilité* ex cathedrâ *a été proclamée.* Saint Léon affirme que l'autorité de la chaire de saint Pierre suffit à elle seule pour rêsoudre une question dogmatique fondamentale et il demande au concile œcuménique non pas de définir le dogme, mais de consentir, pour la paix de l'Eglise, à la définition donnée par le pape qui, de droit divin, est le gardien légitime de la vraie foi catholique.—*La Russie et l'Eglise Universelle*, p. 181.

on his ruling as equals or superiors never crossed his mind. And the words of the bishops themselves show, in my estimation, that such a thing never occurred to them either.

They accepted the Tome because (to use their own words) " Peter has spoken these things through Leo."[36]

To take what Leo himself says first. In his letter regarding the council held at Constantinople under Flavian dealing with the matter of Eutyches, he writes to the Emperor Theodosius and plainly shows that what he sets forth concerning the Catholic Faith is irreformable and fixed :

" *cum in libello suo, quem ad nos misit, hoc saltem sibi ad promerendam veniam reservaverit, ut correcturum se esse promitteret* quidquid nostra sententia *de his quae male senserat,* improbasset, quid autem Catholica Ecclesia universaliter de sacramento dominicae incarnationis credat et doceat, *ad fratrem et coepiscopum meum Flavianum continent scripta quae misi.*"[37]

And he tells the Council of Chalcedon that he is not wanting in the proclamation of the Catholic Faith, so that they who cannot be ignorant of what he believes in accordance with ancient tradition may not doubt what his wish is, *nec liceat defendi, quod non licet credi cum secundum propheticas voces,* apostolicam doctrinam *plenissime et lucidissime,* per litteras quas *ad beatae memoriae Flavianum Episcopum* misimus, fuerit declaratum, quae sit de sacramento Incarnationis Domini nostri Jesu Christi pia et sincera confessio.[38]

The next passage, from an epistle written by Leo to Theodoret, shows in a particularly marked way the thought of Leo—that after the definitions of his Letter he considered an Œcumenical Council unnecessary, though desirable from the point of view of the peace of the Church ; while in the spontaneous and unanimous adhesion of the Council to his decrees " our material for rejoicing, *the more increases—ut in hoc quoque capiti membra concordent.*"

> " The Lord has not permitted that we should suffer any detriment in our brethren, *but that which He has previously defined by Our Ministry* He confirmed by the irreformable

It is of interest to record his further remark on this. " *Si cette thèse, qui n'a été que développée par le concile du Vatican* (*dans sa* constitutio dogmatica de Ecclesia Christi) *est une hérésie comme on l'a prétendu chez nous, le pape saint Léon le Grand est un hérétique manifeste ou même un hérésiarque puisque personne avant lui n'a affirmé cette thèse d'une manière si explicite, avec tant de force et tant d'insistance.*" Soloviev, *Op. cit.*, 182.

[36] Mansi, vi, 972.

[37] *Ep.* 29. See also *Ep.* 33.

[38] *Ep.* 93.

(*irretractabili*) assent of the brethren ; in order to show that that which was first formed by the First of all Sees, and was received by the judgment of the whole Christian world, emanated from Himself, so that the members should agree with the Head."[39]

This is sufficient regarding Leo's view. Did the Easterns take the same ?

Evidently they did. The Emperor Marcian wrote to inform Leo of his accession, and of his determination to make the orthodox faith prevail, and for this he begged the aid of him who was chief in the Church τήν τε σὴν ἁγιωσύνην ἐπισκοπεύουσαν καὶ ἄρχουσαν τῆς θείας πίστεως and that he favours the holding of a Council σοῦ αὐθεντοῦντος.[40] In another epistle he writes, describing the object of the Council καθὼς ἡ σὴ ἁγιωσύνη κατὰ τοὺς ἐκκλησιαστικοὺς κανόνας διετύποσε.[41]

A third letter came from the Empress Pulcheria, informing the Pope that the Archbishop Anatolius of Constantinople had subscribed the Tome without any hesitation, and she spoke of the coming council, its function and authority, using words similar to Marcian's.

σοῦ αὐθεντοῦντος ὁρίσωσιν.[42]

It may be recalled that the martyred Flavian had (see above p. 178) declared that Leo could settle the affair himself. There was no need of a General Council.

> *" Res namque solo indigent ex vobis impulsu atque subsidio, quod per vestram prudentiam ad tranquillitatem et pacem cuncta statim translaturum est. Sic enim et quae insurrexit haeresis, et ob eam excitatus tumultus facile cessabit, Deo cooperante, per vestras sacras litteras, prohibebitur vero et quae evulgatur futura esse Synodus ; ut ne sanctissimae totius orbis Ecclesiae perturbentur."*[43]

A glance at the records of the council shows that the members of the council took the same view. Maximus of Antioch in the first session proves the orthodoxy of Flavian because his doctrine was in accord with the Tome of Leo :

> " Archbishop Flavian, of holy memory, expounded the Faith rightly and in agreement with the most blessed and holy Archbishop Leo, and we all eagerly receive it."[44]

In the second session, Cecropius, Bishop of Sebastopol, met with universal approval when he said :

[39] *Ep.* 120, and Soloviev, p. 177.
[40] *Ep.* 73. [41] *Ep.* 76. [42] *Ep.* 77. [43] *Ep.* 26.
[44] Mansi, vi, 678. Hefele, iii, p. 309.

"On the Eutychian question a text had already been given by the Roman archbishop, which they (that is, he and his nearest colleagues) had all signed."

And all the bishops exclaimed:

"That we also say, the explanation already given by Leo suffices, another declaration of faith must not be put forth."[45]

And Florentius of Sardis: "I, for my part, believe the letter of Leo is sufficient."[46] At the fourth session the papal legate said:

"The holy synod holds fast the rule of faith which was ratified by the Fathers at Nicæa and by those at Constantinople. Moreover, in the second place, it acknowledges that exposition of the creed which was given by Cyril at Ephesus. In the third place, the letter of the most holy man *Leo, Archbishop of all Churches*, who condemned the heresy of Nestorius and Eutyches, shows quite clearly what is the true faith, and this faith the synod also holds, and allows nothing to be added to it or taken from it."[47]

Some bishops of Illyricum and Palestine had at the second session asked for explanation of the wording of three passages in Leo's letter which raised objections in their minds.

At this fourth session they declare:

"That they were inviolably devoted to the faith of the fathers of Nicæa and Constantinople, and to the decrees of the first Synod of Ephesus, and that they were also fully convinced of the orthodoxy of the most holy father and Archbishop Leo. But that which in his letter appeared to them not quite clear, and liable to be misunderstood, the papal legates had explained quite satisfactorily when they were all assembled with Anatolius, and had anathematised every one who separated the manhood of our Lord from His Godhead, and did not confess that the divine and the human attributes existed in him *unmingled* and *unchanged* and *undivided* (ἀσυγκύτως ἀτρέπτως ἀδιαιρέτως). On this they had in a body signed Leo's letter and had agreed with him."[48]

As Mansi says, "They did not approve that epistle as though without their approbation it lacked anything in the way of

[45] Hefele, iii, p. 316.
[46] Hefele, iii, 316.
[47] Mansi, vii, 7. Hefele, iii, 330.
[48] Mansi, vii, 27.

irrefragable authority, but to show that they themselves fully recognised in it the traditional faith of the Lord's Incarnation." The purpose of the examination he says again was " for a better understanding of the words, but not because there was room to doubt concerning what had already been defined."[49]

. . . . . .

The Easterns to-day commemorate Leo the Great on February 18th. There is a lengthy panegyric of him and praise for his Tome, which they describe as " a column of orthodoxy." In the Basilian Menologion (p. 319 *seq.*) and in the hymns of his Feast these passages occur :

" Rising as the morning dawn from the West, thou, thrice Blessed, sentest forth thy volume of holy dogmas as rays of light upon the Church.

" *The Successor of the venerable Peter, enriched with his presidency,* and possessing his burning zeal, moved by God puts forth his volume.

" Moved by God, thou didst set down the teachings of religion as on tables impressed by God : appearing, like a second Moses to the company of venerable teachers."[50]

All this, be it remembered, of a pope who declared himself ruler of the Christian world and asked who would be so ignorant or so envious as to pretend that there was any part of the Church which was not directed by Peter's care, which did not grow from his aid.

. . . . . .

It is from what œcumenical councils say, imply, take for granted, or act upon, that the deductions of this Dissertation are drawn.

I can therefore, in view of the testimony marshalled in this chapter, but agree with Soloviev :

" *Pour rejeter comme une usurpation et une erreur la primauté de pouvoir et l'autorité doctrinale du siège romain, il ne suffit pas, comme on le voit, de déclarer usurpateur et hérétique un homme tel que saint Léon le Grand :* il faut encore accuser d'hérésie le concile œcuménique de Chalcédoine *et toute l'Eglise orthodoxe au V^e Siècle.*"[51]

[49] *Nat. Alex.*, ix, 525 and 526.
[50] Nilles, *Kalendarium*, i, pp. 106–108.
[51] *La Russie et l'Eglise Universelle*, p. 202.

CHAPTER XI

THE CONSEQUENCES OF CHALCEDON

Eutyches and Monophysitism were condemned by the Council of Chalcedon. But Monophysitism continued to flourish, if Eutychianism waned. For Monophysitism and Eutychianism are not equivalent terms. There were, and are, many Monophysites who condemn Eutyches. In fact the majority would.[1]

By the "Eastern Church" we now mean the Orthodox Churches, whose chief figure is the Patriarch of Constantinople.

But after the Council of Ephesus and the Council of Chalcedon, great bodies of the Oriental Churches, sympathetic with, or, maybe, not altogether alive to the bearings of, the teachings and heresies of Nestorianism and Monophysitism, broke away and formed schisms from the orthodox Churches—schisms which still at this day endure.

There was shown above (p. 4) the East Syrian Church, the Church of Persia, the Church of Armenia, Catholic in doctrine and in full communion with the West. And evidence was given of their teaching on the pre-eminent position of Peter in the apostolic band and in the Church.

All these separated Eastern Churches, then, spring either from Nestorianism or from Monophysitism—they are either "Nestorian" or "Monophysite."

The point now is, that when they pass into heresy and schism, they still, oddly enough, retain belief in, and afford by their documents many supports and considerable evidence of, Petrine primacy. The Church of Armenia must, at first, have accepted the Council of Chalcedon, for ten Armenian bishops were present at that synod and signed the acts.

As a matter of fact, the Armenians held the Faith of Chalcedon for ninety years. Why then did the Armenian Church come to reject it? The answer must be found to a certain extent in the reason already given for the spread of

[1] See Lebon, *Le Monophysisme Sévérien* (Louvain, 1910); R. Janin *Les Eglises Orientales*, p. 7.

Nestorianism—that the empire had accepted the opposite; and the empire, instead of helping them against the Persians by whom they were over-run, had failed them. Their patriarch Joseph, the bishops, and the generals of the army of Vartan had in their extreme distress appealed to Theodosius for aid against the Persians, who, they said, "were going to destroy among them the Faith received from the Prince of bishops who is at Rome."[2] Theodosius died soon after this, but they found his successor Marcian more hopeless still. Thus they were prejudiced against anything favoured by Marcian[3] and therefore against Chalcedon, of which he was the great supporter. National feeling was also always very strong in Armenia, and it had its influence in increasing their keen desire to be independent.

But there was also the difficulty caused by the paucity of their then language to represent the theological terms involved in the dispute.[4] The primitive Armenian Church agreed with the Faith of Chalcedon—a speech of Sahag (Isaac) at the Synod of Aschtischat (435) shows his Christology perfectly in accord. *Nos confitemur Christum ex duabus naturis unam hypostasim, unam personam, et unum Christum.*

The letter of Leo to Flavian, too, had not been faithfully translated into Armenian, and interested heretics and schismatics used the opportunity to cause discord and discontent.

The Emperor Heraclius brought about a temporary re-union of the Armenians with the Eastern Church.

But in 645 they relapsed.[5] A synod at Tovin denounced Chalcedon. Attempts still were made at re-union from time to time and Armenian bishops took part in the Œcumenical Councils of Constantinople II (553), Constantinople III (680) and Nicæa II (787).

The Armenians to-day still acknowledge the pope as Patriarch of the West and the chief of the bishops of the Church—though some of its writers would have it that the primacy was conferred by the Council of Nicæa and lost by the "apostasy" of Chalcedon.

Here it is useful to give one or two quotations of what Armenian writers of our period have to say of Petrine prerogatives.

The Patriarch Sahag (Isaac), who died in the year that Leo

[2] Tournebize, *Histoire Politique et Religieuse de l'Arménie*, p. 80.
[3] cf. *ibid.*, p. 87.
[4] See *Op. cit.*, p. 88 and p. 555, n. 5.
[5] Pargoire, *Op. cit.*, pp. 43, 183.

the Great became Pope, wrote in 426, i.e. twenty-five years before the Council of Chalcedon, a letter in which he says :

> " The precept of God commends to us, not a Church built of stones and wood, but the human race built on a rock by faith in the truth. Wherefore the true faith is the Church which gathers us together and builds in the unity of the knowledge of the Son of God, for He Himself the Life-giver, teaches us saying to Saint Peter : ' Thou art Peter and on this Rock I will build my Church and the gates of Hell shall not prevail against thee.' " (Note his altering ' it ' to ' thee.') " Now, when we hear Peter called a rock, what are we to understand to be said ? That it is like a stone among stones ? Far from it, but it is as man using reason, the head of the apostolic band ; and since he with immovable faith confessed Christ the Son of the living God, he obtained the blessing and was called Rock. So, too, those who are built on it are not inanimate stones, but men sharers in the same faith, since the Holy Scriptures do not hesitate often and often where there is need to call Our Lord and Saviour by this name."[6]

An interesting collection of passages from Armenian writers supporting Petrine privileges is given by Cardinal Marini in the work to which reference has been already made " *Il Primato di S. Pietro e di suoi Successori in San Giovanni Crisostomo,*" and the standard work of Tournebize on Armenia, " *Histoire Religieuse de l'Arménie,*" furnishes a good many also.[7]

John Mantagouni, patriarch from 482-489, in a solemn discourse, speaks of referring to the doorkeeper and key-bearer of heaven those who had made shipwreck of the faith. Like his three predecessors, this patriarch accepted the faith promulgated and defined at Chalcedon.

. . . . .

To return to the years more immediately succeeding the Council of Chalcedon and its condemnation of Monophysitism, Pope Leo's labours in the controversy were by no means finished by his work at Chalcedon. As one studies the history of these Easterns it is plain that theological questions are often, if not always, made national questions—the rivalry between Alexandria and Constantinople is the key to much. It requires little imagination to conceive the hot indignation and violent hostility that the condemnation and humiliation of the proud ecclesiastical " Pharaoh " at the hands of Constantinople,

[6] See pp. 212–221.

[7] e.g. pp. 57, 78, 80, 87, 165, 357, etc. cf. *P. G.*, lxv, 856. Tixeront, *Précis de Patrologie*, p. 35. Bardenhewer-Shahan, *Patrology*, p. 591.

meant from the side of the fanatical hordes of ignorant Egyptian monks. The Nestorian and Eutychian quarrels, in different forms, still continued long to trouble the East.

Proterius had been chosen by those who accepted Chalcedon to succeed Dioscorus at Alexandria, and supported by the Emperor Marcian, the orthodox became the imperial party—the "Melkites."[8]

The death of Marcian (457) was the opportunity for fresh trouble. The Monophysites chose Timothy Ailurus, who, consecrated by three Monophysite bishops, became the rival of Proterius. The latter was murdered,[9] and Timothy was bold enough to ask the new emperor (Leo I) to recognise him as Patriarch of Alexandria.

The Emperor was inclined to accede to his request, and Anatolius supported him. But in spite of the letter which they sent out to the bishops asking their opinion of Timothy and his petition, and suggesting a council, all save one were against him, and Pope Leo the Great was adamant against opening questions already answered. "*Non ad confligendum cum hostibus fidei, nec ad certandum contra ullos . . . . tanquam dubia vel infirma sint quae tanta per Spiritum Sanctum fixit auctoritas.*[10]

The result of all this was that for the time being Timothy the Cat was sent into exile—another Timothy (Sakophakiolos) being set up as the Catholic patriarch.

Meanwhile at Antioch also there was trouble. Peter the Fuller was objecting to Chalcedon, and got himself made Patriarch of Antioch, sympathised with and supported by Zeno, son-in-law of the emperor and afterwards emperor himself. The Fuller it was who became famous as the inventor of the phrase "who was crucified for us," which he inserted in the Trisagion—a phrase which, but for its origin, need not have been suspect.[11] He too went into exile.

But the reign of Zeno was interrupted by a rebellion of Basiliscus, who made himself emperor for a year, and during that time he restored Timothy the Cat and Peter the Fuller.

Basiliscus went so far as to issue a letter condemning Chalcedon and Leo; and he frightened more than five hundred bishops into signing it.

The archimandrites of Constantinople appealed to the Pope

[8] From the Syrian word "Malka"=royal. They were the "imperialists," holding to the religion of the emperor and to Chalcedon.

[9] Robertson, *Op. cit.*, p. 272.

[10] *P. L.*, liv., 1143, Ep. 162.

[11] Pargoire, *L'Eglise Byzantine*, p. 26.

Simplicius. Their letter is not extant, but the Pope's replies to them and to the Emperor are. Pope Simplicius counsels the Emperor to imitate his predecessors Marcian and Leo, and maintain the Council of Chalcedon and the letters of S. Leo. "For the rule of apostolic doctrine abides always unaltered with the successor of him to whom the Lord entrusted all the flock and promised His perpetual assistance to the end of time, against whom He has promised that the gates of hell shall never prevail, and to the sentence of whom He has declared that what has been bound on earth cannot be unbound even in heaven itself."[12] To the archimandrites Simplicius writes that there is no need, after the letters of S. Leo, for any further explanation of the Faith.

And now comes the Acacian Schism.

Acacius, the founder of a schism that lasted thirty-five years, is to be remembered as he "*qui, le premier, apprit à l'Eglise grecque à vivre séparée de la Chaire de saint Pierre.*"[13]

The key to the troublous situation is to be found in the XXVIIIth Canon of Chalcedon, though this famous canon was never placed in any Eastern Code of Canon Law till Photius did so. I may remark *en passant*, that even judged by the test of "universal consent," it can never be looked upon as a judgment and decree of the "Catholic" Church. Rejected by the West, like the IIIrd Canon of Constantinople, how can it be looked upon as of œcumenical validity?

Acacius, however, was determined to make it the means of fostering his ambition—though, as we have seen, even the Easterns had, anyhow in appearance, renounced it. This is the only hypothesis one has by which to account for his changes and vacillations.

Acacius at first had merited by his zeal the praise of Pope Simplicius, to whom he had denounced Peter Mongos, suspected both of Eutychianism and of having had some part in the murder of Proterius. And when Basiliscus issued his daring encyclical, alone of all the Oriental bishops, Acacius had the courage to resist him.

The Pope, Simplicius, urges Acacius to influence the Emperor in the Catholic direction, to join the monks in opposing the Cat, and assures him that there is no need of a council, the error of Eutyches having already been thoroughly dealt with. As the result, the Patriarch stirred up the monks against the

[12] Mansi, vii, 974. *Simplicii ep.*, 4, 5, 6, 7.

[13] A. Roux, *Le Pape Saint Gélase Ier* (Paris, 1880). cf. Soloviev, *Op. cit.*, xxix. *Premier Schisme formel entre l'Orient et l'Occident.*

usurper, and Basiliscus fled.[14] Evidently Acacius was at this time a whole-hearted supporter of the Apostolic See.

But conscious of the influence which he found he possessed in bringing about the expulsion of Basiliscus and the return of Zeno, Acacius apparently began to dream ambitious dreams of dominating the East and breaking with the see of Rome. For Pope Gelasius tells us that many of his predecessor's letters were ignored and unanswered. And when the two most important sees of the East happened to be vacant at the same time, it probably occurred to Acacius that now was his opportunity of uniting under his leadership all who were at loggerheads with Rome.

Soon after Zeno's restoration Timothy died, but his usurpation was continued by Peter Mongos. Then, when the Catholic Timothy Sakophakiolos died, the Egyptians wanted Peter Mongos to succeed him. But a Catholic (John Talaia) was chosen.

Acacius had excommunicated Mongos, but now they became friends and allies, and each in the other found a suitable auxiliary for his schemes and ambitions.

Zeno, since Egypt and Syria, the two most populous rich and powerful provinces of the empire, were specially affected by Monophysitism, and with the Monophysitism was mixed up a good deal of anti-imperialist feeling, embarked on a policy of compromise and " comprehensiveness "—a policy which would be continued for many weary years and bring nothing but dissatisfaction in trying to conciliate the Monophysites. Hence the genesis of the decree Henoticon, which consisted of :

1. The Niceno-Constantinopolitan symbol.
2. Cyril's XII Anathemas.
3. The decrees of Ephesus.
4. The Condemnations of Nestorius and Eutyches.

Christ is " one not two" and " two natures " is avoided. But there was nothing said about the Tome of Leo or about Chalcedon except adversely. " Whoever thinks or has thought otherwise, whether at Chalcedon or at any other synod, is excommunicate,"[15] gives the text of the Henoticon. The men really responsible for this Henoticon were Acacius and Peter Mongos. The Emperor judged that this decree, which would be acceptable to the Monophysites, could also be signed by

[14] Evagrius, *P. G.*, lxxxvi, 2609.

[15] *P. G.*, lxxxvi, 2620. See pp. 276–7. Robertson, vol. ii, *Op. cit.* Soloviev, *Op. cit.*, pp. 27, 34.

the orthodox, as, so far as it went (apart from the clause about Chalcedon), it was patient of a Catholic interpretation. But of course it really satisfied nobody.

John Talaia was driven from his see of Alexandria and Mongos took his place, intruded by the Emperor. The ejected patriarch fled, like Athanasius, to Rome to the Pope, to denounce both Acacius and Peter to him as heretics.

The difficult stage for both Acacius and Zeno arrives now. It is to obtain the confirmation of the election of Mongos from the Pope.

Simplicius, in spite of a letter from Zeno accusing Talaia of perjury, hesitated to give the consent of the Apostolic See to Mongos, and Acacius kept silence when information was sought.[16]

The next pope, Felix II, wanted Acacius to come to Rome to a council, to have the charges against him investigated. But his legates to Constantinople were imprisoned and then cajoled, with the result that they communicated with Acacius and betrayed their mission.

When Felix had heard from John Talaia about all that had happened in the East, he excommunicated Acacius as the author of the Henoticon, and for being responsible for the presence of Peter Mongos at Alexandria and for Peter the Fuller at Antioch. To be in communion with Mongos, an out-and-out Monophysite, was to cease to be a Catholic. And, as Hormisdas later wrote, "To receive the Tome of Leo and to maintain in the diptychs the name of Acacius are contradictory things."[17] Felix excommunicated his treacherous legates too, while Acacius, for his part, removed the name of the pope from his diptychs.

Some monk dared to pin the document of excommunication to the vestments of Acacius as he went to the Liturgy in S. Sophia, but although Talaia was recognised by the Roman Council as the lawful Patriarch of Alexandria, he was never able to take possession of his see, but, spending the rest of his life in Italy, became the friend and helper of Pope Gelasius I.

At Constantinople the Pope had devoted adherents in the monks, the Akoimetai, the "sleepless ones,"[18] eager to maintain communion with the apostolic see. They fearlessly denounced the action of their bishop and publicly reproved the conduct of Mongos, who, not content with signing the Henoticon, had even gone to the length of anathematising Chalcedon.

[16] Mansi, vii, 992.

[17] Thiel. *Ep.* xlvii.

[18] So-called because of their keeping up by night as well as day a ceaseless round of prayer.

Felix II[19] still protested his desire for the reconciliation of "this unfortunate" Acacius. But his hopes were not realised. A few years, and Peter the Fuller, Acacius, Mongos, and Felix II were all dead.[20] But the schism still went on, though Euphemius, who after Flavita became Patriarch of Constantinople, desired communion with the Holy See, stipulating however, that the name of Acacius should not be removed from the diptychs.

. . . . . .

The really great pope, Gelasius I, ascended the chair of Peter in 492, and the affairs of the East claimed a great deal of his attention. Out of forty-three of his letters which are extant eleven are devoted to these questions.

The chief thesis of the letters is that the rehabilitation of the name of Acacius is impossible, since this prelate is dead without any sign of repentance, condemned by a sentence just from every point of view, and all the excuses alleged by his supporters are ridiculous.[21] And the complaints he makes against Acacius are that he upset in the East the discipline established by the Council of Nicæa; though a mere suffragan of Heraclea, he exalted himself above the patriarchal sees of Alexandria and Antioch; arrogating to himself the power which belongs only to the pope, he took upon himself to settle the question between two claimants for the second see. When he was summoned to Rome to the papal council he took no notice of the citation; he encouraged and harboured notorious heretics, and, worst of all, he corrupted the papal legates in favour of Mongos, and gave a blow, in the mind of the weak, to the fundamental dogma of Catholic unity, the indefectibility of the Apostolic See in the purity of Faith.

All this, whatever one says of it in itself, shows what the relation was in which Rome claimed to stand towards the East, at the end of the fifth century.[22] And Gelasius bases his contentions on Scripture and traditions and the most famous Eastern prelates:

> "It is the canons themselves which have willed that the appeals of all the Church should be referred to this see, but that from its sentence no appeal could be made. It is the see which the words of Jesus Christ, the tradition of our

[19] *Ep.* xiv.
[20] Robertson, p. 280.
[21] See Roux, *Le Pape Gélase Ier*, p. 38.
[21] Robertson, p. 283, speaks of the "unbending haughtiness of Gelasius."
[22] *Ep.* iii. The references are to the edition of Thiel.

Fathers, and the authority of the canons support, in order that it may have authority to judge all the Church."[23]

Again he writes: "The Universal Church well knows that what has been bound by whatever pontiff, the See of the Blessed Apostle Peter has the right of loosing, because to it has been given to judge all the Churches, and no one has the right of judging what has been once decided."[24]

The Epistles 3, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 18, 26, 27, all deal with the question of Acacius. But Ep. 11 is really a letter to Gelasius, a reply from the Bishops of Dardania. It is a protestation of the fidelity of Eastern bishops to the Apostolic See, that they observe in everything the precepts of their fathers and follow inviolably the rules of the holy canons, and so endeavour to obey all, with a common faith and an equal devotion to the Apostolic See of the Roman pontiff exalted and angelic.

Ep. 12 to the Emperor Anastasius furnishes us with one example of many which occur in the writings of Gelasius—of instances of the Pope's teaching on the distinction between the spiritual and civil powers, and the supremacy of the former. "And the charge of pontiffs is the much more heavy, because at the judgment of God they will have to give account of kings themselves. You know, most clement Son, that although you preside over the human race by your dignity, you are nevertheless subject to the ministers of sacred things . . . . if in that which concerns order and public administration the pontiffs of religion, recognising that the empire has been entrusted to you by a disposition from on high, obey your laws, with what assiduity ought you not to obey those who are set up to dispense the sacred mysteries."

The writings of these popes of the fifth century are extremely interesting in their so uncompromising claims. Whether the emperors like it or not, whether the emperors recognise it or not, the popes assert that they are above the monarchs, that there is no appeal from the Roman see, and that no council can set aside their decision: that Peter speaks through them, and, as the Acts of Ephesus recorded, "ever lives in his see and gives judgment."

Acacius, more than once, averred that the popes owed their pre-eminence in the Church to their being bishops of the capital city of the empire, and now that that capital was transferred to Constantinople, the first rank should go to its patriarchs.

[23] *Ep.* xxvi.
[24] Robertson, vol. ii, *Op. cit.*, p. 285.

Gelasius fitly replied :

> " We laughed at the prerogative which is desired to be attributed to Acacius because he was the bishop of the imperial city. Hasn't the emperor resided for a long time at Ravenna, at Milan, at Sirmium, at Trier, and have the bishops of these cities exceeded the limits that antiquity fixed for them ? . . . The secular power of the empire is one thing ; the distribution of ecclesiastical dignities is another thing. However small a town may be, it does not diminish the greatness of the prince who resides there ; in the same way, the presence of the emperor does not change the order of the hierarchy."

The Acacian Schism had now lasted nearly thirty years. The policy of compromise still had its strong supporters, though recent essays in that direction had shown so little success. The Monophysites must indeed be reconciled, but not at the price of any modification of the settled Faith. There were, however, plenty of orthodox " Chalcedonians " in the East, and especially at Constantinople. They saw that the only means of preventing the further spread of the growing heresy was to have the help of the West. Negotiations were entered upon with Pope Anastasius II (496-498), but were frustrated by his early death. Pope Symmachus, his successor, received in 512 from Eastern bishops a letter begging for the communion of Blessed Peter " the Prince of the Apostles," and promising obedience to the Apostolic See.

The Eastern bishops were weary of the schism, and their letter begging for reunion will show that the high claims made by the popes were hardly strange, or novel, or unacknowledged in the East.

Having referred to the parables of the Lost Sheep and Lost Coin, they say they are begging, not for lost sheep or drachma,

> " but for the precious salvation, not only of the East, but of three parts almost of the inhabited world, redeemed, not with corruptible gold or silver, but with the precious Blood of the Lamb of God, according to the doctrine of the *blessed Prince of the glorious Apostles, whose See Christ, the Good Shepherd, has entrusted to Your Blessedness*. Following his example, most holy Father, hasten to help us, just as Blessed Paul, your Doctor, informed in a vision that the Macedonians were in danger, hastened to help them in deed. O Father, full of tenderness for your children, since it is not in vision but in reality that in the eyes of your mind you see us perishing

by the prevarication of our Father Acacius, do not delay, or rather, to speak with the prophet, do not slumber, but hasten to help us. You have not only received the power of binding, but also that of loosing, in accordance with the example of the Master, those who long have been in bonds, nor only the power of uprooting and of destroying, but also that of planting and building, as Jeremias, or rather as Jesus Christ, of whom Jeremias was the type ; nor only that of delivering to Satan for the destruction of the flesh, but also that of restoring by love those long since rejected, lest (which God forbid) Satan, coming to plunge us into the greatest distress, may appear to gain the advantage over you. You are not ignorant of his malice, you whom Peter, your blessed Doctor, teaches always to shepherd, not by violence but by an authority fully accepted, *the sheep of Christ which are entrusted to You in all the habitable world.* We earnestly beg You therefore to tear away this new hindrance which weighs on us, as Jesus Christ our Saviour and our Leader destroyed the old one on the Cross. . . . If Acacius was excommunicated because of his friendship for the Alexandrians or rather for the Eutychians, who anathematised Leo and the Council of Chalcedon, why are we accounted as heretics and subject to the anathema, we who cleave solely to the letter of Leo which was read at the council, who are attacked every day and condemned as heretics by the Eutychians because we preach your orthodox doctrine ?

" Do not disdain to succour us and do not hate us because we are in communion with our enemies. Among those who only had the care of a small number of souls, many have separated from their communion, the others in charge of a numerous flock yielded to the necessity not to abandon, as the hireling, the sheep to the wolf. It is not for love of life, but only for the salvation of souls that a great number of priests act thus. . . . We all, both those who appear to communicate with the adversaries and those who abstain from it, await, after God, the light of your visitation and of your assistance. Hasten then to aid the East, whence the Saviour sent you two great suns to lighten all the earth ; render Him what He sent you, illumine it with the light of the true Faith as He enlightened you with the light of knowledge divine. . . . Just as the Lord said to Paul concerning Corinth ' Speak and keep not silence, for I have a great multitude in this city,' so He says to You to-day ' Hasten and go without delay to the help of the East, for it is not a multitude of a

hundred and twenty thousand men as at Nineveh, but a crowd much more numerous which awaits, after God, its healing from You.'"[24a]

In his acknowledgment of the appeal Symmachus urges all abstention of communion with the partisans of Acacius. Only so could they hope for communion with the Apostolic See.

It took seven years before the healing could be accomplished.[24b]

The Emperor Anastasius was veering more and more in favour of Monophysitism. The lot of the orthodox was a hard one. When Vitalian[24b] the barbarian general found it good policy to espouse the cause of the Catholics, and brought his 50,000 troops to the very walls of Constantinople (514), Anastasius thought it wise to modify his treatment of the orthodox and to seek restoration of communion with Rome. This would be possible on condition that the persecution ceased, the exiled bishops were restored, and a great council should be called together at Heraclea to effect the reunion of East and West. It was suggested that the Pope should be invited to this, but there was no precedent for a pope being present at a General Council, or leaving Rome to be present at a Council of the East. Besides, an attempt might be made to reopen the questions solemnly closed at Chalcedon. It was a delicate situation. Dorotheus, the Metropolitan of Thessalonica, at the head of forty bishops, sought reunion with Rome. They protested their attachment to it and their utter detestation of the heresies of Nestorius and Eutyches.

. . . . . .

Hormisdas, now Pope, acknowledged the Emperor's letters, but he was guarded in his reply. His legates carried to Constantinople letters to Anastasius and Vitalian, together with his conditions for restoration of communion. These negotiations came to little. Hormisdas sends once more his messengers to Anastasius, and they bring his rule of Faith. But Anastasius becomes more reactionary and recalcitrant.

In the East persecution appears again. But the monks appeal to

"The Successor of the Prince of the Apostles," "The Head of all," "The most holy and blessed Patriarch of the whole world."

Hormisdas counsels patience and faith.

[24a] Mansi, viii, 221 *seq.*
[24b] Mansi, viii, 218.

In 518 Anastasius was succeeded by Justin, who, like his nephew the great Justinian, was a Catholic, and Justin speedily took steps to restore union with Rome. This was not now so difficult a task, bearing in mind the Eastern mentality where a sovereign was concerned,[25] and the efforts that had already been made to that end, e.g. John of Nicopolis (516) in his own name and that of others sent to Hormisdas begging for restoration to communion and protesting adhesion to the decrees of Chalcedon.

Pope Hormisdas issued his famous Formula, and all who desired communion with Rome were required to sign it. No modification or alteration could be tolerated, and signatures to the libellus were received from 2,500 Eastern bishops.[26]

This Formula is of extreme importance, not only because of its explicit condemnation of the heresies and heresiarchs and of their supporters by name, but also because of the unequivocal assertion of papal authority to which these Easterns assented.

It puts the Tome of Leo on the same level as the decisions of œcumenical councils—Nicæa, Ephesus and Chalcedon.

It puts in the most uncompromising terms the prerogatives claimed by the Roman see—though, as has been shown before, in earlier sections, those claims had long been made and allowed. It runs :

> " The first condition of salvation is to keep the rule of the orthodox faith and to deviate in nothing from the laws of the Fathers. And one cannot pass in silence the affirmation of Our Lord Jesus Christ who says ' Thou art Peter,' etc. This word has been proved by events, *for it is in the Apostolic See that the Catholic Religion has always been preserved undefiled.* Not wishing therefore to separate ourselves from this hope and from this faith, following also in everything the laws of the Fathers, we anathematise all heresies and specially the heretic Nestorius, formerly Bishop of Constantinople, condemned at the Council of Ephesus by the Blessed Celestine, Pope of the city of Rome, and by Cyril, Bishop of the city of Alexandria. Similarly we anathematise Eutyches and Dioscorus of Alexandria, both condemned at the holy Council of Chalcedon, which we follow and embrace, and which, walking in the steps of the holy Council of Nicæa, proclaimed the

[25] See e.g. Mennas' speech at the council held in Constantinople after the death of Agapitus.

[26] *P. L.*, lxvii, 1211. Mansi, viii, 579. cf. Döllinger, *Hist. Ch.*, ii, 221. Soloviev, p. 40.

apostolic faith. We detest equally Timothy 'the parricide'[27] surnamed Ailurus, disciple of Dioscorus, and Peter of Alexandria (=Mongos) who has imitated him in everything. We condemn also and anathematise Acacius sometime Bishop of Constantinople, who was condemned by the apostolic see, and who was the accomplice and adherent of the preceding; and all those who continued in the communion of these men; because Acacius who entered into communion with them has merited thereby to partake in their condemnation. We condemn also Peter of Antioch (the Fuller) with all his adherents and all these personages above mentioned.

"On the other hand, we receive and approve all the Letters written by the Blessed Pope Leo on the Christian Religion, desiring to follow in everything, as we said, the Apostolic See; and proclaiming all its constitutions.

"I hope therefore to enter into communion with you, representatives of the Apostolic See; *it is there that the Christian Religion finds its perfect solidity.* I promise then, that in future I will not recite in the celebration of the Holy Mysteries the names of those who have been *separated from the communion of the Catholic Church, that is to say, those who are not in agreement with the Apostolic See* (*non consentientes Sedi Apostolicæ*). But if in any way I shall ever attempt to deviate from this my present profession of faith, I declare myself the accomplice of those whom I have condemned.

"This my profession of faith I have subscribed with my own hand and address it to Hormisdas, the holy and venerable Pope of the City of Rome."

This Formulary, then, was despatched for signature to the East, but it met with a certain amount of opposition, chiefly, indeed solely, I think, because of the condemnation of Acacius, who had been very popular at Constantinople, and also because of the omission from the diptychs of his name and those of his orthodox successors. The opposition to signing it did not arise from its clear affirmation of the rights of Rome. No one raised any objection to the powers of the Apostolic See, which were so plainly set out in it.

Hormisdas had a difficult task, no doubt, but he was endowed with a masterful disposition. The accession to power and influence of Justin, Vitalian, and Justinian, all orthodox, would perhaps still more "stiffen" him (if indeed he needed it), and he did not hesitate later to suggest to the Emperor that a little

[27] A strong term signifying his Monophysitism, but it also contains an allusion to his complicity in the murder of Proterius.

physical force might advantageously be used to encourage signatures. But things did not go quite so smoothly as it was given out. The obtaining of the signature of John, the Patriarch of Constantinople, affords a certain interest and subject for discussion as it has of controversy. Hormisdas, we have seen, would not tolerate any modification of his Formula. John wished to send instead his own profession of faith, and when this was ruled out he insisted on adding a preamble :

> " *Sanctissimas enim Dei ecclesias, id est, superioris vestrae et novellae istius Romae, unam esse accipio illam sedem Apostoli Petri et istius augustae civitatis unam esse definio.*"

" John—a poor weak man—did accept it under severe imperial pressure," writes Bishop Gore, " but in accepting it he prefaced it with a statement which evacuated it of its Roman meaning. He somehow identified his own see with the Roman see, so as to admit of the position that he was accepting nothing as belonging to Hormisdas which he himself did not share. Moreover, numbers of Eastern bishops were admitted to the communion of Rome without signing anything except a statement of the orthodox faith."[28]

But Bishop Gore is once again echoing the words of Fr. Puller, who asserts " the Patriarch John managed to blunt very considerably the edge of the Formulary, for by identifying in some curious fashion his own see of new Rome with the papal see of old Rome, he managed to claim for the Constantinopolitan see a share in all the special privileges which in the Formulary were assigned to the Western apostolic chair."[29]

But John could hardly claim a share in " *all* " the privileges of old Rome. For example, Constantinople was not a " See of Peter."

When John prefaced to the Formula, " For I hold the most holy Churches of your elder and of our new Rome to be one Church. I define that see of the Apostle Peter and this of the imperial city to be one see," he might be simply expressing the oneness of faith and closeness of union in a striking manner just as Gregory the Great (in Ep. VII. 40) speaks of the " oneness " of Antioch, Alexandria and Rome.[30] It may be that

[28] Art. " Papal Rome and the Orthodox East," *The Christian East* (June, 1924), p. 69.

[29] *Primitive Saints and the See of Rome*, p. 400.

[30] Gregory writes to Eulogius, Patriarch of Antioch : " Who does not know that the Church was built and established on the firmness of the Prince of the apostles, by whose name is implied a rock ? Hence, though there were several apostles, there is but one apostolic see, that of the Prince of the apostles, which has acquired great authority ; and that see is in three

he has Byzantine ideas and aims at the back of his mind. Nevertheless, he does not withdraw anything from the declaration required by the Pope. By signing, he agrees that Rome is the see of Peter ; that it is because of the words of Christ to Peter—" *Tu es Petrus* "—that in *sede Apostolica inviolabiliter semper custoditur religio.* He declares that union with Rome is communion with the Catholic Church (*cf.* " *sequestratos a communione Ecclesiae Catholicae id est, in omnibus non consentientes sedi apostolicae* ").

He desires to follow Rome in everything since in Rome is " the true and perfect solidity of the Christian religion." *Sequentes in omnibus sedem apostolicam, et praedicamus omnia quae ab ipsa decreta sunt, et propterea spero in una communione vobiscum quam apostolica sedes praedicat me futurum, in qua est integra Christianae religionis et perfecta soliditas.*[31]

Personally I find it hard to see how his preamble blunted the edge of the Formulary. He subscribed to all these " Roman Claims." What more could the Pope want ?

The Formula, indeed, is reproduced textually in the Letter *Redditis mihi* (28 March 519) of John of Constantinople announcing to Pope Hormisdas his submission.

Mgr. Batiffol's comments on the above remarks of Bishop Gore are very much to the point. " *Bishop Gore accuse Jean d'être un pauvre homme,* ' a poor weak man,' *qui a accepté toutes les conditions imposées par le pape Hormisdas et par l'empereur Justin : ceci rend déjà invraisemblable qu'il ait par son préambule vidé la formule de la signification que Rome lui donnait. Mais, en fait, cette préface n'affecte pas la formule et affirme l'union que Jean déclare vouloir entre son siège et Rome.*"[32]

As regards the last paragraph of the passage from Dr. Gore's article, " numbers of Eastern bishops were admitted to the communion of Rome without signing anything except a state-

places—in Rome where he died, in Alexandria where it was founded by his disciple S. Mark, and in Antioch where he himself lived seven years. These three therefore are but one see, and on that one see sit three bishops, who are but one in Him Who said, I am in My Father, and you in Me, and I in you."

[31] Mirbt, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Papsttums* (1901), p. 71. Mansi, viii, 451. Cavallera, *Thesaurus Doctrinae Catholicae*, p. 200.

[32] Mgr. Batiffol's " Rejoinder," *The Christian East* (Dec. 1924), p. 182. cf. with this estimate the following, E. Amann (*D. T. C., t.* vii, p. 169) : *Le préambule de Jean ne reniait rien des prétentions excessives de l'Eglise de Constantinople et semblait mettre sur le même pied l'ancienne et la nouvelle Rome. . . . Le patriarche declarait adhérer aux quatre conciles ; or jusqu'ici Rome n'avait officiellement reconnu celui de Constantinople, dont un canon affirmait la préeminence religeuse de la ville impériale sur tout l'Orient.* Thiel *Epist.* lxi. *Dans la joie du succés on ne remarqua pas ces nuances dont se températ la soumission byzantine.*

ment of the orthodox faith," he is again but following Father Puller.[33] And the lack of basis for this statement has been so trenchantly and so completely exposed by Dom. Chapman, that there is nothing to add. His strictures will be found in the footnotes, and Mgr. Batiffol agrees with Dom. Chapman's words: "Fr. Puller's blunder is such a big one that a public withdrawal would be desirable," when he says: "*l'exposé est à reviser de très près.*"[34]

The Formula of Pope Hormisdas was signed by the great Emperor Justinian, as we shall later see. And the bishops at the Eighth General Council all subscribed it.[35] But as this council is not now acknowledged by the Eastern Churches as œcumenical, and as our deductions are drawn from the Seven Œcumenical Councils common to East and West, the weight of the Formula, from an Eastern point of view, is certainly lessened.

[33] *Op. cit.*, p. 401.

[34] Mgr. Batiffol's "Rejoinder," *Christian East* (Dec. 1924), p. 184. cf. "He (*sc.* Fr. Puller) tells us that Pope Hormisdas wrote to the Patriarch Epiphanius (John's successor) allowing him to admit certain Eastern Churches (where a difficulty was made about expunging the names of former bishops, who had been perfectly orthodox) to Roman communion by making a declaration of faith containing nothing about the see of Rome. We are not told why the omission of Roman claims should please the Churches who did not wish to condemn their past bishops, but the wide conclusion is drawn: 'The larger portion of the Eastern Church was admitted back to communion with the West on its own terms, rather than on the pope's terms.' *Now we have only to look at the documents to see that Fr. Puller had not read them.* The bishops in question (of Antioch, Jerusalem and Syria Secunda) had prefaced their petition to the emperor with a paraphrase of the Roman formula or libellus, speaking of 'the Church of God, which resting upon the Rock of the chief of the apostles, retaining a right and inflexible confession, confidently with him exclaims, Thou art Christ the Son of the living God' (Mansi, viii, 511). The emperor (*ibid.*, 510) bases his plea for indulgence on a precedent set by Pope Anastasius (*ibid.*, 189). Hormisdas sent a plain answer. Epiphanius is to use his judgment. He must transmit to the apostolic see a list of all whom he reconciles, enclosing the contents of the libelli they send in (*ibid.*, 1032). This profession must be faithful to the original formula, '*eodem tamen, ut dixi, tenore conscriptam*' (*ibid.*, 1036). Similarly in his letter to the emperor, the pope says that Epiphanius may admit to communion those who are worthy, *libelli tamen, qui a nobis interpositus est, tenore servato* (*ibid.*, 520). It would be difficult to contradict Fr. Puller more categorically. *Nothing can be more certain than that not a bishop of the East was admitted to full Catholic communion except on the terms of Rome.* If ever document was 'of faith' in the East, it was this document of Hormisdas, and, I repeat, there is no evidence of any objection whatever having been made to it, except in so far as it implied the omission from the diptychs of former bishops who had been really orthodox, and had been merely in unavoidable schism through the fault of the emperor. *Father Puller's blunder is such a big one that a public withdrawal would be desirable.*" Dom. J. Chapman, *The First Eight General Councils and Papal Infallibility*, p. 45, *seq.*

[35] The names of Photius and his adherents taking the place of the heretics named in the original formula, see Hefele-Leclercq, iv, 489, *seq.*

Hormisdas was succeeded by John I, and this pope is to be remembered as the first pope to visit Constantinople.[36] It was not a willing visit however ; it was, in fact, one from which he shrank. The Arian king Theodoric had incongruously compelled him to undertake the conduct of an embassy to Constantinople, to obtain from the Emperor Justin mitigation of his severe policy,—the stern repression of the Arians in the East. For the Churches of the heretics had compulsorily been surrendered to the Catholics, and they themselves had been subjected to the utmost pressure to make them accept the Catholic Faith.

The enthusiasm and reverence with which Pope John was received in Constantinople were remarkable : the whole city being moved, and in its thousands going out to greet with crosses and lights "the vicar of the blessed Apostle Peter," and by their devotion " to honour the blessed Apostle Peter."[37]

Mgr. Batiffol, in his learned and illuminating brochure, *Les Survivances du Culte impérial romain* (p. 20), remarks that Pope John " *ne protesta pas en voyant l'empereur Justin rendre ' au vicaire du bienheureux apôtre Pierre l'hommage de l'adoration.' 'Justinus Augustus, dans honorem Deo, humiliavit se prornus et adoravit beatissimum Johannem papam.' (Lib. Pontf., t. i.*, p. 275). *L'historiographe romain que nous citons ne proteste pas davantage, il voit dans l'hommage rendu au pape un honneur qui s'adresse à Dieu ' dans honorem Deo.'* "

And we need not exaggerate the import of this tribute, bearing in mind the extraordinary fondness for ceremonial of the Byzantine people and since, as M. Bréhier in the same book later observes, (p. 59), " *Comme les autres rites d'ailleurs, l'adoration perdit beaucoup de sa force et devint un pur geste d'étiquette. Lorsque le pape vient à Constantinople au sixième et au septième siècle, l'empereur l'adore, mais le pape à son tour adore l'empereur. De même au dixième siècle, l'empereur et le patriarche s'adorent mutuellement lorsqu'ils se rencontrent à Sainte-Sophie.*"[38] And he refers us for illustration to the visit of Pope Constantine to Constantinople.[38a]

Pope John celebrated Mass in Hagia Sophia according to the Latin Rite at Easter 526, and the Emperor Justin, although he had been crowned at the beginning of his reign by his own

[36] Robertson, ii, p. 290.

[37] *Liber Pontificalis* (ed. Duchesne), i, 274. Robertson, ii, 289. cf. *Anonymus Valesianus*, 15, 90. *"Justinus imperator venienti ita occurrit ac si beato Petro."*

[38] *De. Caer.*, i, 9. *P. G.*, cxii, 253.

[38a] *Liber Pontificalis* i., 389.

patriarch " submitted to a new coronation at the hands of the successor of S. Peter."[39]

Documents relative to this pontificate are scanty. But it is evident from the " glory " with which the pontiff was received in Constantinople, and by the way in which he was treated by Theodoric on his return (he was cast into prison at Ravenna, where shortly afterwards he died), that the Catholics were satisfied, not only with his attitude towards the Arians, but also with his confirmation of the Faith ; and that, while doubtless urging the emperor to clemency and forbearance with them, he had no idea of compromising or modifying the doctrine of the Church.

[39] Robertson, ii, 290, *Op. cit.*, quoting the *Liber Pontificalis*. Milman, *Hist. Lat. Chr.*, i, 301, *seq.*

CHAPTER XII

THE PAPACY IN THE TIME OF THE EMPEROR JUSTINIAN—THE FIFTH GENERAL COUNCIL

When Justinian ascended the throne there was manifested not only a great emperor, but also a considerable theologian. For sovereigns to interest themselves in matters theological could be a good thing and a profitable thing for the Church, but when, as so often, they favoured or tolerated heresy, it was seen that this interest had established a bad precedent, and their influence was of immeasurably evil consequence to the peace of the Church and to the harmony of East and West.

However, in this particular case, no objection was taken by either pope or patriarch to the action of an emperor who was not only orthodox, but a learned theologian too.[1]

To divert the Emperor's attention from Origen and the Origenists,[2] Theodore Ascidas, Archbishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia—who though one of the chiefs of the Origenist party was *persona grata* at the court—directed Justinian's zeal to other questions of doctrine in which the Emperor might find a congenial field for the exercise of his theological propensities.[3]

[1] cf. Chapman, *The First Eight Councils and Papal Infallibility*, p. 49. See Pargoire, *Op. cit.*, p. 130.

[2] cf. Justinian's issue of edicts and condemnations in the Origenist controversy. Hefele remarks (vol. iv, p. 220): "The question of ecclesiastical authority as to whether the emperor was entitled or not to issue an edict of this kind, belongs to another department. It seems to me that we have here before us, one of those many and great, even if well-meant, Byzantine encroachments which does not disappear even when we assume that the emperor acted in agreement with Mennas and Pelagius." Baronius held that the edict of Justinian against Origen was drawn up by the papal legate Pelagius and the Patriarch Mennas (*Ann.* 538, n. 32).

[3] cf. Diehl, *Theodora Impératrice de Byzance*, p. 299. *"Très fier de cette découverte par laquelle il espérait jouer un bon tour à son rival d'influence, le nonce romain Pélage, il en avisa Justinien et flattant la manie théologique de l'empereur, il le supplia d'examiner l'affaire. Il lui représenta en outre qu'il y avait là un moyen, aisé et orthodoxe tout ensemble, de dissiper les défiances des monophysites, et que le concile "renouvelé et épuré" serait sans difficulté accepté de tous."*

See also Pargoire, *Op. cit.*, p. 36.

It was thus that the question of the Three Chapters now absorbed his interest.

Justinian was scheming to reconcile the Acephali, a small sect of the Monophysites, to the Church. Ascidas suggested that the best and quickest way of effecting this was to condemn:

(1) The person and writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia.
(2) The writings of Theodoret against Cyril and the Council of Ephesus.
(3) The Epistle of Ibas, Bishop of Edessa, to the Persian Maris.

These writings were undoubtedly "Nestorian." This fact admits of no dispute, for Nestorius had popularised the teaching of Theodore of Mopsuestia. Eloquent, learned, a facile and voluminous writer (so much so, indeed, that he was known as *par excellence* "The Exegete"),[4] it yet seems strange, notwithstanding the orthodoxy of a great deal of his works, that Theodore should have escaped condemnation for much of his teaching till long after his death.

Cyril of Alexandria writes: "A countless multitude of brethren have suffered no slight harm from what Diodore, Bishop of Tarsus, and he who was Bishop of Mopsuestia, the most eloquent Theodore, have written of Christ the Lord and Saviour of us all."[5]

S. Thomas Aquinas[6] concisely states Theodore's teaching. Theodore's view comes to this: that a man is indwelt by the Logos. He argues that the union (συνάφεια) is so close between the man and the Logos that they may be said to be one person in the same way in which it is said of husband and wife that "they are no more twain, but one flesh." But, as Aquinas points out, the union of husband and wife "does not authorise us to predicate of the one whatever can be predicated of the other—for not whatever is true of the husband is true of the wife or vice versa—therefore in the case of the union of the Word with that Man, as this Nestorian doctrine has it, we should not fail to notice how the properties of that Man, belonging to His human nature, cannot fitly be predicated of the Word of God or God."

Theodore was, in his opposition to Apollinarianism, over-anxious about the reality of Christ's humanity and human

[4] cf. Swete, *Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Minor Epistles of S. Paul*, vol. i, p. 81, and J. Orr, D.D., *The Progress of Dogma*, pp. 183–5, the *Revue Biblique* (Jan. 1925), p. 54, *seq.*

[5] *Synousiasts*, i.

[6] *Summa Contra Gentiles*, Lib. iv, cap. xxxiv.

example. To him the " Incarnation " meant a man indwelt by the Logos from the moment of conception, struggling with the passions of the body and soul and gradually brought by the Logos through them to perfection. Christ, he said, had to fight the temptations of the body and soul, and it was not an easy struggle, but ultimately He became incapable of any divergence from good. It was morally impossible for Him to fall owing to His virginal sinless birth, the union of the Man with the Word, and the power which He had also received at His Baptism, but it was by anticipation as the reward of His foreseen sinless virtue that the union with the Logos was bestowed on the manhood of Jesus. It was finally consummated in the state of glory to which the Manhood was elevated.[7]

Of Theodoret, this may be said. He had been a strong opponent of Cyril, and the latter's XII Anathematisms seem specially to have moved him. He wrote against them, sometimes unfairly. In fact he seems to have been rather a heresy-hunter. He detected Apollinarianism and false teaching where no one else could see them, and he hit hard and with warmth.[8] And, like violent opponents, he recoiled too far ; undoubtedly there was a considerable amount of his writing distinctly " Nestorian " in his defence of his friend.

The celebrated Letter of Ibas to the Persian Maris merits attention not only on its own account, but because of its author. Who "Maris" is to whom it is addressed is a matter for conjecture. Labourt[9] says that "Maris" may be the same as Mar (Lord), and so the inscription may be εἰς Μάριν ἐπίσκοπον βηθαρδασιρηνῶν, meaning merely "to Monseigneur the Bishop of Beth Ardashir," as Maris is always described as Bishop of Beth Ardashir (Seleucia). But the Bishop of Seleucia at that time was Dadjesu (see above p. 174). If so, Maris has been wrongly taken for a proper name.

Ibas was a great follower of the teaching of Theodore. He had been with his bishop, that extraordinary man Rabbulas of Edessa, at the opposition-council at Ephesus, which John the Patriarch of Antioch held against Cyril ; but, unlike Rabbulas, he had not gone over to the Cyrilline side, but rather had hardened in his zeal for Nestorius. Ibas was excommunicated by Rabbulas, but Nestorianism had a great influence in Edessa, for

[7] Ottley, *Doctrine of the Incarnation*, p. 388. Bright, *Age of the Fathers*, ii, p. 261.

[8] See *Revue d'Histoire ecclésiastique* (1906), Articles by J. Mahé on the Anathematisms of S. Cyril.

[9] *Le Christianisme dans l'empire Perse* p. 134 note.

Barsumas, afterwards Bishop of Nisibis, the head of the Theological School of Edessa, was a pronounced Nestorian.[10]

When Rabbulas died Ibas succeeded him as bishop. But his opponents worked until he was deposed by the Latrocinium 449 (see p. 184). However, he seems, as time went on, to have become less "Nestorian," and, as he accepted the term θεοτόκος and anathematised Nestorius at Chalcedon, the council restored him to his see, which he held until his death, when the intruded Nonnus could lawfully succeed him (457). The Letter[11] written *c.* 433 in violent opposition to the XII Anathematisms of Cyril, was read at Chalcedon, and no specific judgment was passed on it; apparently it being held that, as he so completely and *ex animo* condemned Nestorius, he condemned anything "Nestorian," including whatever would come under that designation in his own writings.

He had bitterly reproached Rabbulas, whom he was destined to succeed as bishop. "This tyrant of our city," he wrote to Andrew of Samosata, "not content with persecuting the living, allows himself to anathematise the dead." "*Origine obscure de la fameuse querelle des trois chapitres!*" comments the learned Père M. J. Lagrange.[12]

If he had really used the words attributed to him: "I do not envy Christ for becoming God, for I could do the same, if I wished," one can understand the opposition and persecution he experienced. And although he made suggestions at the Council of Chalcedon that the famous letter was fictitious or interpolated, he never actually denied its authorship.[13]

. . . . .

To the Empress Theodora the Monophysites owed much.[14] In her they found a powerful patron. The gallery of Byzantine figures contains few stranger than she. Subtracting most of what her many enemies said of her, the residuum gives us a somewhat startling and romantic figure—the dancing-girl who became a great empress.

There is, indeed, as Prof. Diehl observes[15] something almost

[10] Tixeront, *Précis de Patrologie*, pp. 291–2, *ibid.*, 274 and 423.

[11] Mansi, vii, 241–250.

[12] *Mélanges d'Histoire Religieuse*, p. 222, Art., "Un évêque Syrien du Ve siècle. Rabbulas évêque d'Edesse 435."

[13] See Labourt, *Le Christianisme dans l'empire Perse*, p. 254, *seq.*

[14] Pargoire, *Op. cit.*, p. 28.

[15] Diehl, *Op. cit.*, p. 303. cf. Diehl, *Figures Byzantines*, i, 51–53 (Paris, 1906). Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, vol. iv, p. 213, *seq.*, ed. Bury. cf. Baronius, *Ann.*, 548. Oman, *Byzantine Empire*, p. 66. A vivid if hardly flattering description of Theodora is to be found in a book lately published (1926), *Constantinople*, by George Young. For a fairer estimate see Edward Foord, *The Byzantine Empire*, p. 75, *seq.*

ridiculous in the animosity with which some Church historians have denounced in Theodora a second Eve too docile to the Serpent, a new Delilah, another Herodias debased by the blood of the saints, a citizen of hell possessed and goaded by the Devil, a foe to the concord purchased by martyrs' blood. All this may be greatly discounted, but what remains is a masterful woman of somewhat doubtful morals and sanctity, not overscrupulous in her methods, who knew how to influence in religious matters the ecclesiastical policy of her orthodox husband, and to affect his relations with the great see of the West.

. . . . . .

Justinian is one of the great figures of history. He is "the last of the Roman emperors." His conquests, his buildings, above all, his laws, which, as Gibbon said, "still command the respect or obedience of independent nations,"[16] alone would secure for him a permanent niche in the Temple of Fame. But he is not quite such a demi-god as his enthusiastic admirers would fain make out. Nor, on the other hand, does he merit all the detraction that some of his critics or belittlers would award him. He is a sovereign difficult to judge and estimate.

His ecclesiastical tyranny merits the description "*Tyran bigot*" bestowed upon him by an authority on matters Byzantine,[17] but though he compromised with Monophysitism and apparently in his declining years favoured one of the minor sub-divisions of the heresy, "*hérésiarque,*" which the same writer calls him, seems rather too strong a term.

In him one sees the "priest-king"—the type of the Byzantine conception of the emperor who would be supreme in matters ecclesiastical as well as civil.[18]

Certainly in his dealings with the popes the best side of his character is not seen. This strange, gloomy man, who sat far into the night poring over the problems of theology, and whose leisure hours were filled with the theological disputations of the doctors who surrounded him, not only wielded the weapons of persecution against Pagans and Jews, but grievously harassed and distressed the Church itself.

But before considering the question of the Three Chapters and its bearing on our investigation, and estimating Justinian's dealings with the unhappy Pope Vigilius, it is as well to ask what the Emperor thought of the papacy itself, even if his

[16] *Decline and Fall*, chap. xliv, ed. Bury, iv, 441.

[17] Gasquet, *Op. cit.*, p. 236.

[18] Robertson, ii, 333. Pargoire, *Op. cit.*, 8, and Art., "Justinien," *D. T. C.*

practice did not always correspond with his profession. His writings attest and confess the Roman primacy. He addresses Pope John II (533-535) as "*Head of all the Churches.*"

> "We," he writes, "allow nothing which concerns the state of the Churches, however manifest and undoubted, not to be made manifest to Your Holiness, who is the Head of all the Churches, for in all things we are anxious that the honour and authority of Your See may increase."[19]

And when forwarding a "libellus" of faith to the pope, he says he wishes

> "to follow in all things the apostolic see."

To Pope Agapetus (535-536) he describes Rome as—

> "the source of the priesthood," and "the venerable See of the most high Apostle Peter."

He says:

> "No one doubts that the height of the Supreme Pontificate is at Rome."

This pope visited Constantinople, and while there, deposed for his being tainted with the Monophysite heresy the Patriarch Anthimus, who had had the support of the emperor. In fact, the Pope consecrated with his own hands Mennas as successor to the patriarchal throne. It is noteworthy that Pope Agapetus insisted on Justinian's clearing himself by presenting the Formula of Hormisdas. The Confession of Faith which Justinian sent to Agapetus (536) opens with it.[20]

But it is instructive to study this visit and its circumstances a little more closely. It is very significant and arresting.

The kingdom of Italy was threatened from Sicily by Belisarius, charged by Justinian with the recovery of his territory.

Theodahat, the Gothic king, in his extremity implored the pope, Agapetus, to betake himself to Constantinople, there to intercede with Justinian for his menaced land.

The pope was not unwilling to make the arduous journey and

[19] Mansi, viii, 795. This letter is inserted in the 2nd edition of the *Code* with the pope's reply. *P. L.*, lxvi, 17, *seq.* John II died not long after this in prison at Ravenna. The letter begins, "Ascribing to the Apostolic See and to Your Holiness the honour which was and is always our wish, and, as is right, honouring Your Blessedness as a Father, we hasten to bring to the knowledge of Your Holiness whatever concerns the state of the Churches; for it has always been our earnest desire that the unity with Your Apostolic See and the state of the holy Churches should be preserved as it has up till now subsisted and remains firm without any contradiction. For this reason we have hastened (519) to make subject and to unite to Your Holiness all the bishops of the entire East."

[20] See Soloviev, *Op. cit.*, p. 41. Mansi viii, 840, 857. *Liber Pontificalis* i, 297-299.

to undertake this embassy, since urgent appeals had come to him from the monks of Constantinople to take all means for the defence of the Faith imperilled by the advent of their new patriarch Anthimus. And Ephraem, the patriarch of Antioch, and other bishops too, had sent to him the same request.

To meet the expenses of this task, not only had money to be borrowed of the king, but, so poor was the papal treasury, they had to pledge even the sacred vessels of St. Peter's.

In February (536), then, Agapetus, accompanied by a small suite, among the members of which was the " deacon of the Apostolic See " Pelagius (afterwards pope)—arrived in Constantinople. He was welcomed with considerable pomp and ceremony—the Senate and high dignitaries of Church and State coming out to meet him.

He lost no time in going to visit the emperor to lay before him the request of the king. But in vain he pleaded with Justinian to cancel his plans—they were too advanced, he said, and already had cost too much.

This makes what follows all the more remarkable. By the scheming and urging of Theodora, the patriarchal see had been filled by Anthimus, Bishop of Trebizond.

This translation of a bishop from one see to another was anyhow contrary to the canons—the procedure was generally stigmatised as " adultery "—though instances of it have been already seen.[21]

But Anthimus, who ostensibly was Catholic and made great profession of his orthodoxy—(he promised Justinian that he would " faithfully follow in all things the Apostolic See " ; he wrote to the same effect to the other patriarchs, Peter of Jerusalem accepting his assurances)—was at the same time in active sympathy and relations with the Monophysites, being greatly under the influence of their leader Severus who lately had taken up his abode in the capital. Now, greatly emboldened, the heretics had ventured, under the smile of Anthimus, to erect their own conventicles in Constantinople itself.

Requested by the emperor to admit Anthimus to his communion, which since his arrival in Constantinople the pope had resolutely refused, Agapetus demanded from the bishop not only a profession of faith to prove his orthodoxy, but also return to his see of Trebizond. Both conditions were rejected. Agapetus therefore refused his communion.

Whether or not the *Liber Pontificalis* is here historically

[21] See footnote on p. 103 of Fortescue's *The Greek Fathers* on the idea at the back of this.

trustworthy, the incident which it relates is anyhow instructive. The theologian-emperor having indulged his penchant for theological disputations, and having found the pontiff immovable, brought into play even threat of exile. But Agapetus still stood firm and undaunted " I, a sinner," he said, " have longed to see the most Christian Emperor Justinian. I find myself in the presence of Diocletian ; but his threats move me not."[22]

The emperor was checked. Neither the promises of Theodora nor her menaces were, in their turn, able to move the intrepid pope ; and at length Justinian, convinced of the heterodoxy of Anthimus, allowed him to be deposed and Mennas elected in his place. As we have seen, Agapetus himself gave him episcopal consecration in the Church of S. Mary on March 13th 536. " The first of the Eastern Church," remarked the pope later, " who since S. Peter has been consecrated at the hands of the Apostolic See."[23]

The same week Justinian asked the pope to confirm the profession of faith which he had presented to John II and which that pontiff had approved.

But the confirmation which Agapetus gave was tempered in its granting :

> " We confirm it, by Our authority we praise it, We embrace it, not that We have given to laymen the authority of preaching (*non quia laicis auctoritatem praedicationis admittimus*) but because the zeal of true faith is agreeable to the rules of Our Fathers and that it is right to confirm and corroborate it. . . . Your faith is agreeable to the rules of Our Fathers and to the dogmas of the Apostolic See."[24]

The monks, led by the Exarch Marianos, are not content with the deposition of Anthimus and his relegation to his proper see. They will not be satisfied till Anthimus is degraded from the episcopate and the Monophysite writings are committed to the flames.

In the appeals which they make to the pope, they address him as " œcumenical patriarch " (οἰκουμενικῷ πατριάρχῃ) while the bishops who are at Constantinople inscribe their demand for the condemnation of the writings of Severus to Agapetus πατρὶ πατέρων καὶ πατριάρχῃ :

[22] Gasquet, *L'autorité impériale*, p. 236.

[23] Mansi, viii, 922. cf. Baronius, *Ann.*, lxiii, 536. "Mennas received the universal episcopate by the hands of Agapetus, and he alone, the twenty-first bishop of his Church, had the favour of being ordained by the bishop of the see of Rome."

[24] Migne, *P. G.*, lxvi, 37.

"Make the most pious Emperor understand that all his zeal for the Churches will serve him nought, if such a disorder attacking the True Faith grows by the liberty allowed to the heretics; and if they are permitted to nestle in the houses of the great . . . . and there continue their unlawful practices. Although intolerable we support these evils . . . . for God most clement, Who opportunely made known to us your arrival, has put into our heart the hope that just as He sent Peter the glorious Prince of the Apostles to the people of Rome to confound the magic of Simon, so He has sent you to confound and drive away Severus, Peter, and Zoaras, and all those who resemble them."[25]

To Peter, the Patriarch of Jerusalem, who, as we have said, was inveigled into accepting the communion of Anthimus, the pope wrote, to inform him and the other bishops of his obedience of what had taken place in Constantinople. He reproves him for his laxity, and continues, "We found the see of Constantinople usurped, contrary to all the canons, by Anthimus, Bishop of Trebizond. Our desire was to lead his soul back not only with regard to this point, but, what is more important, regarding the confession of the True Faith; but, attaching himself to the error of Eutyches, he despised the Truth. Wherefore, after having, according to apostolic charity, awaited his repentance of this belief, we decreed that he be deprived of the name of Catholic and of priest, until such time as he fully receive the doctrine of the Fathers who maintain the Faith and discipline of religion.

You must reject likewise the others whom the Apostolic See has condemned."[26]

A little more than a month and the pope was dead, carried off by sudden illness; and Constantinople seems to have excelled herself in the pomp and circumstance of his obsequies.

But his work against Anthimus did not cease. On May 2nd a council presided over by Mennas, next to whom came the representative of the Apostolic See who had accompanied Agapetus on his mission, decreed the deposition and degradation of Anthimus "conformably to the sentence of the most holy pope."

And to-day may be found in ancient liturgical books of the East, a memorial of Agapetus "who deposed the heretic Anthimus, patriarch of Constantinople, declared him anathema, then

[25] Mansi, viii, 895. [26] *Ibid.*, viii, 922.

consecrated Mennas, whose doctrine was irreproachable, and raised him to the see of Constantinople."[27]

. . . . . .

To resume : In a Constitution, addressed by Justinian to the Patriarch of Constantinople (*Code* I, 1, 7), he says :—

" We preserve by all means the agreement of union of the holy Churches with the most holy Pope and Patriarch of Elder Rome, to whom we are also writing. For *we do not suffer that anything which touches the state of the Churches should not be brought before His Blessedness as being the Head of all the most holy bishops of the Lord,* and because as often as heretics have arisen in these parts, they have been brought to naught by the sentence and just judgment of that venerable see."

In other words all questions of order are to be referred to the pope, who has ever refuted Eastern heresies.

In Novella 9 he writes :

" No one doubts that the sublimity of the sovereign pontificate is at Rome."

and in Nov. 131 :

" Following the decisions of the councils, we decree that the most holy Pope of Elder Rome is the first of all priests."

When we deal with the question of Illyricum and the foundation of the autonomous archbishopric of Justinianopolis we shall see that Justinian asks permission of Pope Vigilius and says that the holder of the see will be " the vicar of the Apostolic See of Rome."

And then we may record the famous distinction which he attempts to make between the see of Rome and its occupant (see below p. 246). *Unitatem vero ad Apostolicam Sedem et nos servamus, et certum est quod et vos custodietis.*[28]

But while he recognises the Roman primacy his aspirations for his own patriarch appear. It is apparent that he does not wish Canon XXVIII of Chalcedon to be a dead letter.

In Nov. 131 he writes :

" We decree that the most holy Pope of old Rome be the first of the priests, that the most blessed Archbishop of Constantinople, which is New Rome, have the second place

[27] De Maistre, *Du Pape*, p. 47.
See also Nilles, *Kalendarium*, i, 140–141, ii, 493, for his commemoration by Easterns on April 17.

[28] Mansi, ix, 367.

after him, and be preferred to the bishops of all the other sees."

But we even read in one constitution of Justinian :

"The Church of Constantinople is the head of all the Churches,"[29]

but this is probably to be taken relatively with regard to the Eastern Churches.

The title "œcumenical patriarch," of which we shall have to speak later, finds already place in several of his *Novellae*, e.g. 3, 5, 6, 16, etc.

. . . . . .

The Emperor's dealings with Pope Silverius (537) are instructive if unpleasant.[30] The city of Rome and all Italy was in the throes of a crisis. The kingdom of the Ostrogoths was visibly passing "distracted by factions and crimes."[31] Theodoric had been able to hold the various rivalries and antipathies together, but his family did not possess his gifts, and the people remembered that he who called himself the "Emperor of the Romans" lived across the sea.[32] So when Belisarius appeared with his forces in a Rome deprived of any real government for nearly a century, he was, not unnaturally, enthusiastically welcomed.

But its bishop was to suffer for the bold act of his predecessor, Agapetus, in deposing Anthimus at Constantinople.

The pope was deposed ; the reason given out was that he had been in secret dealings with the Ostrogoths against the emperor.[33]

This charge was false, and Belisarius knew it was false. The real reason was that an excuse was wanted to get rid of him unless he would consent to the re-establishment of Anthimus.

The ambitious deacon Vigilius, the Pope's apocrisiary at Constantinople, the tool of the Monophysite Theodora, handed to the Pope a letter with this request. Silverius firmly refused, although, as he himself said, he saw in the refusal the end of his days. "I cannot re-establish a heretic condemned in his impiety."

[29] *Cod. Just.*, i, Tit. ii, art. 14, Nov., 119 and 133.

[30] Pope Silverius was the son of Pope Hormisdas (see *D.T.C.*, Art., "Innocent I," vol. vii). The writer, E. Amann, says there is nothing improbable, bearing in mind the epoch, that Innocent I was likewise son of Pope Anastasius, as Jerome says (*Ep.* cxxx, *P. L.*, xxii, 1120). Gregory I was great grandson of Pope Felix.

[31] Robertson, ii, 293.

[32] Gasquet, *L'Autorité Impériale à Byzance*, p. 238.

[33] cf. Diehl, *Op. cit.*, p. 293. Lebon, *Le Monophysisme Sévérien*, p. 76.

" Seek what opportunity you can," wrote the angry Empress Theodora to Belisarius, in answer to this, "to depose Silverius, and send him to us. We address to you our very dear Apocrisiarius, the Archdeacon Vigilius, who is charged to restore Anthimus." When the Pope was brought to the house of Belisarius, Antonina,[34] the latter's wife, exclaimed : " Tell us, my Lord Pope, what we have done to you and the Romans that you wish to deliver us to the Goths " ; while at the same time the subdeacon John tore off the pontiff's pallium. Clothed in a monk's simple frock, he was sent an exile to Patara.

The Bishop of Patara was horrified. This *Eastern* bishop went to Constantinople and in person protested to the Emperor. *After all, he reminded Justinian, there were many kings in the world but only one pope.*

Justinian was so far moved by this entreaty that he ordered the Pope to be sent back to Rome for a fair trial, but death released the persecuted Confessor in Palmaria, for he was probably starved to death on this island of Pontus.[35]

Vigilius, then, obtains the papacy—the reward of his treachery to Silverius—the price Theodora pays him for the furtherance of her aims—for she manages to get him installed at Rome, thus hoping to secure the heart of the West, whence to propagate the Monophysitism so dear to her.[36] But, to Theodora's chagrin, with the popedom there comes to Vigilius a consciousness of its powers and claims and duties.

He had promised his patroness to annul the Council of Chalcedon, to restore Anthimus, to inform Severius and Theodosius of his agreement with their Monophysitism ; and Theodora,[37] in return, had laden him with riches, and had cleared

[34] ". . . . the favourite and confidante of the Empress Theodora. His position, indeed, was not unlike that which Marlborough, owing to his wife's ascendency, enjoyed at the Court of Queen Anne. Like Marlborough, too, Belisarius was ruled and bullied by his clever and unscrupulous wife. Unlike the great Duchess Sarah, Antonina never set herself to thwart her mistress, but after Theodora's death she and her husband lost favour, and in declining years knew much the same misfortune as did the Marlboroughs."—C. Oman, *Byzantine Empire*, p. 74. See also Gibbon, iv, 321.

[35] *Lib. Pontif.*, xvi. Baronius, *Annal.*, 538, 13.
Cath. Encycl., Art. " Silverius," by J. P. Kirsch.

[36] cf. Diehl *Théodora Impératrice de Byzance*, p. 290. *" Quand la basilissa, furieuse d'avoir du céder aux exigences d'Agapit, songea, pour trouver sa revanche, à faire un pape de son choix disposé à transiger avec les monophysites, Vigile, bien en cour, et dont l'ambition semblait garantir la docilité, parut l'homme qu'il fallait pour servir les entreprises de la souveraine."* cf. Fortescue, *The Lesser Eastern Churches*, p. 201.

[37] cf. Diehl, *Op. cit.*, p. 291. *" Visiblement, dans la nomination du nouveau pape, Justinien s'était resolu à laisser carte blanche à Théodora, désireux de lui offrir cette compensation à l'échec qu'elle venait d'éprouver et peut-être aussi secrètement satisfait d'une solution qui rétablirait l'unité dans l'Eglise, en mettant le pontife romain d'accord avec les Orientaux."*

and speeded his way to the throne of S. Peter. But he was "capable of promising everything, or at least of letting everything be hoped for."[38] But when once installed in the Chair of Peter his whole attitude, for the time being at least, changed. He saw things in a different light. The letter which he is said to have written to Severius, Theodosius, and Anthimus, protesting his adherence to their doctrine, is plainly a forgery,[39] but his profession of faith to the Emperor and to the Patriarch Mennas leaves nothing to be desired on the score of orthodoxy.

Theodora was infuriated at the dashing of her hopes, for Vigilius was proving himself as adamant as Silverius in this question of Anthimus.

Circumstances combined to steady Vigilius for the time being. The troubles left by the war in Italy were not conducive to the quietness necessary for attention to theological questions, and the West was devotedly attached to the tradition of S. Leo and to the Council of Chalcedon; while even Theodora thought it prudent not to ask for the immediate repayment for her bribes[40] and the fulfilment of his promises. But fulfilment she expected, and was determined to have. It was merely deferred.

What Theodora could be, how she could be revenged for any betrayal of her policy, she showed in the case of the ill-fated Arsenius,[41] no longer willing to further her Monophysite propaganda; and Vigilius might learn therefrom what he was to expect, should he fail to realise the hopes and schemes of the Empress.

And this brings us back to the Three Chapters.

Without doubt all the writings were, as we saw, "Nestorian," and in parts intensely so. Theodore was more than "Nestorian," but he died in communion of the Church.[42] Theodoret was a friend of Nestorius and defended him; and in his defence had said things indefensible and false of the teaching of Cyril of Alexandria. But, as we have seen above, he had appealed to the Pope, and Leo had restored his bishopric to him; and, after anathematising Nestorius, he had been allowed to take his place in the Council of Chalcedon.

The letter of Ibas to Maris had been read at Chalcedon,

[38] cf. *ibid.*, p. 291.

[39] On the spuriousness of this letter see the references in Art. "Vigilius," by J. P. Kirsch, in *Cath. Encyl.*

[40] 700 pounds of gold, it is said.

[41] cf. Diehl, *Op. cit.*, p. 297.

[42] It was unusual to condemn a man long dead. But compare, however, the case of Origen.

and though it was heretical, it had not been actually condemned.

Why, then, did the West oppose the condemnation of the Three Chapters when confessedly these writings were tainted with heresy?

It was because the Monophysites saw in the condemnation of these Three Chapters a subtle triumph of their cause, in that it seemed both to them and their opponents tantamount to a rejection of the Council of Chalcedon.[43]

Theodora therefore, through Justinian, plans to get the Pope to Constantinople. He will be more pliable and amenable there in the Byzantine atmosphere. "Wherever you find Vigilius," she wrote to one of her agents, "save in the basilica of S. Peter, cast him into a ship and bring him here to Constantinople. If you fail, by the Living God! I will have you flayed alive!"[44]

Vigilius was celebrating Mass in the basilica of S. Cecilia in the Trastevere, when he was kidnapped by the soldiery and hurried on board ship. The Roman populace were indignant at "these manifestations of Constantinopolitan authority which so sudddenly changed their destinies."[45] Groans and cries for his blessing filled the air, and the pontiff with outstretched arm blessed the lamenting crowd.

But there were others who threw stones and refuse at the boat, what time they cursed him. "May you carry the plague and destruction to Byzantium! You have been a curse to the Romans, may you be so to those to whom you go!"[46]

Vigilius certainly took an unconscionable time to do the journey. Purposely, apparently, he stayed ten months at Syracuse, and he did not reach Constantinople till June 25, 547.[47] No doubt he profited by the delay. He had leisure to reflect what his attitude should be. "It emboldened and encouraged him when he saw how he had all the West at his back," and thus, when he arrived at Constantinople, he acted quite differently from what the Easterns expected.

Mennas, the patriarch, had refused to sign the condemnation of the Three Chapters, but being urged, he agreed at length to do so, provided that he should be able to withdraw his signature, should the Pope disapprove.[48] The Patriarch of Antioch

[43] *Justinien qui, sous l'influence de Théodora, revenait alors à la politique de conciliation, se laissa séduire; les dissidents enchantés de voir compromettre l'œuvre de saint Léon, poussaient tous, même les plus intransigeants, à la nouvelle formule d'union*" is the judgment of Diehl on the matter at issue. cf. Op. cit., p. 299. cf. Pargoire, Op. cit., p. 37.

[44] Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, vol. iv, p. 217.

[45] See Gasquet, *L'Autorité Impériale*, p. 239. Diehl, *Op. cit.*, p. 301.

[46] *Liber Pontificalis. Vita Vigilii.*

[47] cf. Robertson, *Op. cit.*, p. 301.

[48] *P. L.*, lxvii, 625.

explained to Vigilius that he had been compelled by Justinian under pain of deposition to append his signature, while force was used to the same end on the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Jerusalem.[49]

The Pope excommunicated Mennas, who was too frightened to withdraw his signature. Vigilius, indeed, had protested while yet on his journey against the Emperor's action. He also had commended the action of Dacius, Archbishop of Milan, who, living at that time at Constantinople on account of the troubled state of Italy, had broken off communion with Mennas.

Yet Justinian received the Pope with every mark of respect due to his exalted office and with apparent welcome. But the memory of his past promises, the subtle flattery, the strong will of Theodora, and, some say, threats and ill-usage, combined to effect a weakening of resolution in the persecuted and harassed Pope. At first Vigilius was immovable. "Do to me what you please," he is said to have exclaimed one day to Theodora and Justinian; "it is not most pious princes I have found in you, but a Diocletian and an Eleutheria; for the rest I have the chastisement that I deserve."[50]

The Emperor, it is reported, so far forgot himself as to strike him a blow, and the unfortunate Pope fled for refuge to the church of S. Sergius, and embracing one of the pillars of the altar prayed God to have pity on him. So rough was the treatment of the soldiers sent to remove him, that they dragged down with him the pillar to which he clung. With a rope round his neck, he was taken off to prison.[51]

But this tale, if it is true, is somewhat anticipating. Vigilius is very generally condemned for his weakness and vacillation. He certainly experienced retribution and suffered for his sins; and reaped the penalty of his ambition. But it is hard not to mete out to him a certain measure of sympathy and pity in the persecution and indignity inflicted on him, in the constant pressure to manipulate him exerted by the Byzantine emperor. He would hardly have "wobbled about" had he stayed in Rome. But to be in the very sphere of influence of the Monophysite Empress Theodora, to whom he owed everything, is some explanation of his vacillating and temporising. And it is to be remembered that he never compromised the Faith.[52]

[49] See Hefele, iv.

[50] See Gasquet, *Op. cit.* p. 240. cf. too Mansi, xi, 153. *Contestor quia etsi me captivum tenetis, beatum Petrum apostolum captivum facere non potestis*, which he is related to have said on one occasion to his tormentors.

[51] *Theophan. Chronic.*, and Robertson, *Op. cit.*

[52] Indeed, both parties in the dispute were perfectly orthodox, which

The Eastern bishops, as was their wont, followed the will of the sovereign, and almost eagerly signed the condemnation of the Three Chapters. Vigilius (we have seen) dared to excommunicate Mennas. But his position was getting daily intolerable. He gathered seventy bishops together for discussing the question, and, in the face of the opposition of the Western bishops there, he sent forth his *Judicatum* (548).[53] Only fragments of this important document survive. But it is known that he condemned the authors of the Three Chapters and at the same time attempted to safeguard the respect due to the Council of Chalcedon. This compromise was useless, and antagonised both Easterns and Westerns. But he showed even then, by his action, his unwillingness to be dictated to by the Emperor in a matter of dogma. He was now practically with Mennas and the Easterns, and against his own Westerns—forsaken even by his own deacons; and parts of the West refused to accept his decision. In 550 he persuaded Justinian to allow him to recall the *Judicatum*, and the Emperor agreed, provided that he would condemn the Three Chapters when a suitable opportunity presented itself. Justinian deposed the Patriarchs of Antioch and Alexandria, who had changed their view. Vigilius, brutally handled, now fled to the church of St. Euphemia at Chalcedon, the scene of the great Council of that name, as to a "city of refuge," and thence he wrote a letter of protest to the whole Church—"Vigilius, Bishop of the Catholic Church, to all the People of God."[54]

Then Mennas comes with other bishops. They protest their devotion to the apostolic see and all its constitutions.[55] When one considers the circumstances: the Pope a persecuted "prisoner," the disfavour and permitting of ill-treatment on the part of the Emperor, it is all very arresting. It throws a good deal of light on the dignity acknowledged by the Easterns as necessarily attached to the great see of the West, even in the person of such a weak occupant as Vigilius. These Eastern bishops, with the patriarch at their head, the second great figure in the Christian Church, come to the hunted fugitive and protest that their one desire is the unity of the Church, they hold fast to the Four Holy Synods, Nicæa, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon; they give complete assent to the

really makes the controversy so particularly disedifying and worthless. See Chapman, *First Eight General Councils*, p. 50.

[53] "*Le pape Vigile croit pouvoir tout finir en fulminant lui-même . . . . son* Judicatum" (Pargoire, *Op. cit.*, p. 37).

[54] Mansi, ix, 50.

[55] *Ibid*, ix, 62.

Letters of Leo and anathematise all who act against them. As regards the Three Chapters, they deny that they have done anything contrary to the agreement between Emperor and Pope, and they promise that all writings shall be given to the Pope. They ask pardon of Vigilius for all the injuries and insults inflicted on him, as if they were themselves responsible and had committed them. They ask forgiveness for communicating with those whom the Pope had excommunicated.[56]

May 5, 553, saw the opening of the Council. It began with the reading of the Emperor's letter by the deacon Stephen. In it Justinian thus spoke of himself:

> "The efforts of my predecessors, the orthodox emperors, ever aimed at the settling of controversies which had arisen respecting the Faith by the calling of synods. For this cause Constantine assembled 318 Fathers at Nicæa, Theodosius 150 at Constantinople, Theodosius the Younger the Synod of Ephesus, the Emperor Marcian the bishops at Chalcedon. . . . When now the grace of God raised us to the throne, we regarded it as our chief business to unite the Churches again, and to bring the Synod of Chalcedon, together with the three earlier, to universal acceptance."[57]
>
> "But the Nestorians want to impose their heresy upon the Church, and, as they could not use Nestorius for that purpose, they made haste to introduce their errors through Theodore of Mopsuestia, the teacher of Nestorius, who taught still more grievous blasphemies than his . . . For the same purpose they made use of those impious writings of Theodoret which were directed against the First Synod of Ephesus, against Cyril and his twelve chapters, and also the shameful letter which Ibas is said to have written. They maintain that this letter was accepted by the Synod of Chalcedon, so would

[56] See Hefele, iv, p. 286, and Chapman, *The First Eight General Councils*, p. 54. Fortescue, *The Lesser Eastern Churches*, p. 201, *seq.* Perhaps some of Vigilius' troubles may have arisen from his ignorance of Greek. Though he spent eight years at Constantinople, he apparently never acquired the language In fact, as remarked before, the language question is a considerable factor in the causes of the ultimate schism.

[57] Hefele, iv, 298. cf. Pargoire, *Op. cit.*, p. 37. "*Il n'en faut pas davantage, bien que son édit soit orthodoxe, pour soulever l'épiscopat d'Occident, car l'Occident prend la mesure impériale pour une atteinte au IVe concile qui a reçu Théodoret et Ibas dans sa communion.* La décision de Chalcédoine, il est vrai, a visé uniquement la profession de foi présentée par les deux prélats en 451 et non leurs écrits antérieurs. *Quant à Théodore de Mopsueste, maître de Nestorius, les pères ne s'en sont même point occupés. L'acte de Justinien n'a donc rien d'antichalcédonien en soi : blâmable parce qu'il émane d'une autorité incompétente et suscite inutilement de nouveaux débats, il ne blesse point le dogme Catholique.*"

free from condemnation Nestorius and Theodore, who were commended in the letter. . . . When, for example, Vigilius, Pope of Old Rome, came hither, he . . . . repeatedly anathematised in writing the Three Chapters and confirmed his steadfastness . . . . even by the condemnation of his deacons Rusticus and Sebastian. . . . Then he issued his *Judicatum* in which he anathematised the Three Chapters. . . . He also wrote to Valentinian, Bishop of Scythia, and Aurelian, Bishop of Arles, that nothing might be undertaken against the *Judicatum*. . . . Letters were exchanged between you (*sc.* Eutychius the Patriarch) and Vigilius in order to a common assembly. But now he had altered his view, would no longer have a synod, but required that only the three patriarchs and one other bishop (in communion with the Pope and the three bishops about him) should decide the matter. In vain we sent several commands to him to take part in the synod. He rejected also our two proposals, either to call a tribunal for decision, or to hold a smaller assembly, at which, besides him and his three bishops, every other patriarch should have place and voice, with from three to five bishops of his diocese. . . ."

Justinian once more refers to the incriminated writings and persons. The "impious letter" of Ibas particularly moved him.

"And as they say that the Council of Chalcedon has received this letter you must compare the declaration of this council relating to the faith with the contents of the impious letter."[58]

So opened the first session of the council to which Vigilius consented, but which Vigilius refused to attend. When the letter was finished, a deputation, including the president and the chief members, went from the council to the Pope to invite him to take part. Vigilius pleaded ill-health, and the deputies reported to the council that the Pope requested them to come again next day for his answer.

The answer which Vigilius gave the deputation was that he refused to take part in the synod because the number of the Orientals was so great and he had so few bishops with him, that he must beg the Emperor to allow more bishops to come from Italy.

To this they demurred ; they had the same faith ; it was not right for him to distinguish so sharply between Eastern and

[58] Hefele, iv, 301.

Western, and they pointed out how that in the first Four Œcumenical Councils few Westerns had been present, while indeed there were a good many African and Illyrian bishops at present in Constantinople. Vigilius then proposed that they should meet in equal numbers. " I will take three bishops with me ; then from the other side let the three patriarchs come with one other bishop, so that there may be four on each side. But to this they would not agree, and instead suggested that each patriarch should bring with him as many bishops as the Pope.

Vigilius, however, would not move ; and they said that they would act without him. He then declared : " I have asked the Emperor for a delay of twenty days, within which time I will answer his written question. If I have not by that time expressed my opinion, then I will accept all that you decree on the Three Chapters." They pointed out that the matter had already lasted seven years, but he refused to give any further answer.

On May 14, 533, after six sittings of the Council had taken place, Vigilius published his *Constitutum*—the document which (we saw above) he had promised the deputation to prepare. It was subscribed also by sixteen other bishops : nine Italians, two Africans, two Illyrians, and three from Asia (Iconium, Claudopolis, and Melitene in Armenia). Three Roman clerics also signed it, viz. Theophanius, the Archdeacon, and Pelagius and Peter, the deacons.

It is a long document.[59] In it he says he had hoped that soon a synod might be held in Italy or Sicily, but the Emperor was unwilling to agree to this, but proposed Constantinople, and out of love of peace he had assented to this. Vigilius speaks at length about the dispute as to the number of bishops proposed for the conference, and says that while he was considering the matter Theodore, the officer of the palace, handed him the imperial letter in which Justinian had already pronounced judgment on the Three Chapters—and demanded a declaration from the pope on the matter. He mentions again his request for twenty days delay on account of his well-known sickness and that he sent Pelagius his deacon to the bishops, explaining " that as the customary way and manner of meeting had not been observed they ought to wait twenty days longer, and not, in opposition to the rule of the Church, give their own judgment before the appearance of the sentence of the apostolic see, by which course new troubles might arise."

Vigilius gives sixty extracts from Theodore's writings, and

[59] Mansi, ix, 61–106.

manifests their heretical teaching in his responsiones, and condemns them *ex apostolicae sententiae auctoritate*. But he is unwilling to condemn the person of Theodore, even as the Council of Chalcedon was averse from that step. From the example of Leo and Gelasius he shows how unwilling the Roman Church was always to be harsh against the person of the dead, who should be left to the judgment of God.

As to Theodoret, he was surprised that there should be so much animus against him, seeing that more than a hundred years since he had *ex animo* subscribed the sentence of Chalcedon and gladly received the Letters of Leo. The council had required him to anathematise Nestorius, and this he had done with a loud voice, and thereby had anathematised everything Nestorian, even if it proceeded from himself.

As regards Theodoret's opposition to the XII Anathematisms of S. Cyril of Alexandria, it must not be said that the Fathers at Chalcedon had neglected to consider the point. Perhaps it meant that Theodoret had been guiltless of the offence, or, rather, that the Fathers, following the example of Cyril at the reconciliation with John of Antioch and the Orientals, had passed over the insults. Vigilius took it therefore that Theodoret had given adequate satisfaction.

Then, as to Ibas and his letter, the Pope, being ignorant of Greek, had asked competent authorities to investigate the Acts of Chalcedon.

The papal legates had been satisfied of his personal orthodoxy, Anatolius of Constantinople said : " From all that has been read the innocence of Ibas results." Maximus of Antioch : " From the letter read his Catholic confession is clear." Besides Ibas had approved of the reunion of the Orientals and Cyril, and had accepted its confession of Faith. Ibas himself, in harmony with Chalcedon, condemned the attacks which ignorantly he had made on the teaching of Cyril ; and he held communion with Cyril when he understood the orthodoxy of the XII Anathematisms ; and this communion with Cyril he held until his death.

The Latrocinium had wrongfully deposed Ibas, but Chalcedon had restored him, being satisfied with his explanation and convinced that his attacks on Cyril proceeded from ignorance. Moreover, no one must maintain that the papal legates at Chalcedon (who led the way in the restoration of Ibas to his bishopric) had authority only in points of faith, but not in regard to the restoration of wrongfully deposed bishops. Such an opinion was contradicted by the express words of Pope

Leo, who had learned and confirmed all that had taken place at Chalcedon. So Pope Simplicius, and Vigilius himself in his letter to Mennas (i.e. the *Judicatum*). . . . "They must also abide by that which was contained in the testimonies of the bishops and of the papal legates at Chalcedon in regard to the letter of Ibas and his person. And that must suffice for all Catholics which that holy synod had regarded as sufficient, when it declared, 'He shall only anathematise Nestorius and his doctrine.'"

The *Constitutum* ended with these words: "We establish and decree that it be permitted to no one having any ecclesiastical order or dignity to write or publish or undertake to teach anything contrary to the contents of this present *Constitutum* in regard to the Three Chapters, or after this definition begin a new controversy about them. And if anything has already been done or spoken in regard to the Three Chapters in contradiction of this our ordinance, by any one whomsoever, this we declare void by the authority of the Apostolic See."

The Seventh Session, May 26, opened with a speech from the quaestor of the imperial palace, Constantine, sent by the Emperor to report about the attitude of Vigilius. He pointed out that although Vigilius had frequently condemned the Three Chapters by writing and word of mouth, he refused to do this in communion with them and their synod. Vigilius had just sent by Servus-Dei, his sub-deacon, to the Emperor the document he had prepared. The Emperor would not receive it, but sent Vigilius by word of mouth of his minister this answer. "If you have in this condemned the Three Chapters, I have no need of this new document, for I have from you many others of the same content. If, however, you have in this new document departed from your earlier declarations, you have condemned yourself."[60]

The council, as usual, of course, agreed with the Emperor and acceded to his command that the name of Vigilius should be struck off the diptychs,[61] dishonourably and dishonestly pretending that the Pope, by his defence of the Three Chapters, had participated in the impieties of Theodore and Nestorius.

But even here we see the recognition of the papal claims. Justinian endeavours to make a curious distinction between the see of Rome and its occupant. Neither he nor the council desired to break off communion with the Apostolic See.[62] And

[60] Mansi, ix, 349.
[61] Probably on July 14, 553. Hefele, iv, 345.
[62] Mansi, ix, 366.

the synod said, " This is in accordance with the efforts of the Emperor for the unity of the Churches, and we will preserve unity with the Apostolic See of Old Rome."

The Emperor issued a special edict solemnly to confirm the decrees of the council, and Vigilius was sent into exile (though this latter is doubted by some). Some say that Vigilius and his bishops were sent to labour in the mines. The Roman clergy petitioned for the return of their bishop now that Narses had freed the city from the Goths, and to this the Emperor acceded on condition that Vigilius confirmed the decrees of the council.

Vigilius recognised this Fifth Council when he was convinced that the Council of Chalcedon was in no way infringed. On December 8, 553, therefore, Vigilius gave his assent to the Fifth Council[63] in an edict addressed to Eutychius the Patriarch of Constantinople. He claims the example and precedent of S. Augustine to make " retractation." In this document he casts the gravest doubts on the genuineness of the Letter of Ibas, and is convinced of its spuriousness and that the Eutychians had foisted it on him. In opposition to his contention in his *Constitutum* that the legates of the Apostolic See regarded Ibas as orthodox and Maximus of Antioch had vouched for it, he is at pains to show that the Letter to Maris had never been approved by the Council of Chalcedon, and in fact was in absolute contradiction to its teaching. He pronounces a full anathema on the letter and on anyone who maintains that it was declared orthodox at Chalcedon. Theodore of Mopsuestia he declares worthy of condemnation, and the writings of Theodoret against Cyril.

In February 554 he withdrew his *Constitutum*. He probably left Constantinople for Rome in the summer, but died on his way at Syracuse, ending his troubled, harassed career there in January 555. His body was conveyed to Rome to be entombed in the Church of S. Marcellus on the Salernian Way.

The whole dispute had been barren and fruitless. Instead of uniting the Monophysites to the Church as the Emperor fondly imagined, instead of pleasing the Acephali, it had had no such result, but, on the contrary, it had led to great parts of the West refusing to recognise the Fifth Council, and to the formation of large and long-continued schisms, Upper Italy, Tuscany and France being particularly affected. Gregory the Great worked for union, but it was not until about a hundred years after his death that the sores were healed.

The issue was no question of faith, and, after all, Vigilius never

[63] Mansi, ix, 414–420, 457–488. Hefele, iv, 347.

compromised with Monophysitism. And, indeed, he was in a difficult position, torn between East and West. The East was accustomed to agree to whatever the Emperor proposed. The West, as we have stressed, saw in the condemnation of the Three Chapters a subtle and insidious victory for Monophysitism, an ingenious condemnation of the Council of Chalcedon.

But, naturally, Justinian wished to have the Pope at his back.

Vigilius had some self-respect. He knew what was due to his position as Bishop of Rome. And Justinian, it should not be forgotten, *had signed the Formula of Hormisdas* with its clear and uncompromising assertion of papal claims and rights. It is not altogether against Vigilius that he delayed and temporised as he witnessed the activities of the emperor amateur-theologian. Besides, the imprisonment and persecution and indignities to which he was subjected, the thousand violences to which the Pope was exposed "*pour prix de ses légitimes protestations*"[64] would tend to make a man of any spirit recoil.

Whatever one may think of the character of Vigilius; however one may deplore his vacillations; to what extent one may think them without excuse; however much, again, one may feel the barrenness of the discussion; this, at least, emerges, that never at any time was Vigilius heretical. "All his decisions were perfectly Catholic and orthodox."

The whole tangled episode of his eight years at Constantinople tells nothing against "papal claims," but rather for them.

For it is plain from the history of Vigilius and this fifth council that the Easterns by their persistency and perseverance held that the decisions of a council, if it is to be regarded as a General Council, must be ratified by the Bishop of Rome.

. . . . .

The reign of the great Pope Gregory I affords some illustration of the relations of the Eastern Church to Rome, by the sharp and lengthy—and rather arid and unprofitable—controversy, arising out of the use of the title "Œcumenical Patriarch" by the patriarch of Constantinople, John "the Faster."

In the East there was, and still is, a great predilection for

[64] See Pargoire, *Op. cit.*, p. 37, *seq.* cf. Duchesne, *Churches Separated*, p. 47. "No point of doctrine or of faith was discussed at all. It was simply a question as to whether the condemnation of certain books was opportune or not. The pope was inopportunist, the council opportunist, and for the sake of peace the pope gave in to the decree of condemnation. But the proof that he was in the right is shown by the fact that this very condemnation was misunderstood in the West and caused serious troubles and prolonged schisms."

sonorous titles and pompous appellations.[65] Not that they are altogether empty and without significance. On the contrary, they often signify and symbolise much.

The use of the title "New Rome" marked, as we have observed, the beginning of the movement leading to the supremacy, at any rate in the East, of the bishops of Constantinople. And now we have the use on the part of the Patriarchs of Constantinople themselves of the title "Œcumenical Patriarch," a title which, though indeed not new,[66] has apparently hitherto only been used by others *of* them.[67]

[65] It is, however, needful to recall that the restriction of the appellation "pope" itself to the Bishop of Rome is somewhat late in the period of the first nine centuries that we have in review. It was in the sixth century that Ennodius, Bishop of Pavia, and Cassiodorus started the movement to confine the title "papa" to the Bishop of Rome, and the custom gradually prevailed. "The earliest instance of its application to the Bishop of Rome is found on an inscription dating from the time of Pope Marcellinus, who died in 304" (Maycock, *Op. cit.*, p. 4).

"The title was not officially adopted by a Roman bishop until the latter part of the fourth century, when Siricius (384–398) is found using it in correspondence"—*ibid.*

cf. Robertson, ii, p. 328.

But in early times the titles *papa, apostolicus, vicarius Christi, summus pontifex, summus sacerdos, sanctus,* and the like were used freely of other bishops. It was Gregory I who first styled himself Servus Servorum Dei—this as a reproof to "Œcumenical Patriarch." cf. Funk, *Manual Ch. Hist.*, i, 184, also Duchesne, *Op. cit.* The East was prone to high-sounding titles, and they persist to-day, e.g. the Patriarch of Constantinople is styled ὁ παναγιώτατος ὁ θειότατος ὁ σοφώτατος κύριος, ὁ Ἀρχιεπίσκοπος Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, νέας Ῥώμης καὶ πατριάρχης οἰκουμενικός.

Both the Orthodox and Coptic Patriarchs of Alexandria use the titles: ὁ θειότατος καὶ παναγιώτατος κύριος ὁ πατριάρχης Ἀλεξανδρείας, δικαστὴς τοῦ κόσμου.

This last rather startling phrase may take us possibly back to the days and events of Cyril of Alexandria. The Orthodox Patriarch of Antioch is termed ὁ θειότατος καὶ ἁγιώτατος κύριος ὁ πατριάρχης τῆς μεγάλης καὶ θεοτάτης πόλεως Ἀντιοχείας καὶ πάσης τῆς ἀνατολῆς.

The Orthodox Patriarch of Jerusalem is styled ὁ θειότατος καὶ ἁγιώτατος κύριος ὁ πατριάρχης τῆς ἁγίας πόλεως Ἱερουσαλὴμ καὶ πάσης τῆς γῆς τῆς ἐπαγγελίας.

The Head of the Abyssinian Church contents himself with *Abuna*, "our father," and *Aba-Salama*, "father of peace" (see Gondal, *Le Christianisme du Pays de Ménélik*, p. 17). The Melkite Patriarch has this imposing array of titles used in his solemn *φήμη*, the proclamation of a bishop. "The most blessed, most holy, most venerable, our chief and lord Patriarch of the great cities of Antioch, Alexandria and Jerusalem, of Cilicia, Syria, and Iberia, of Arabia, Mesopotamia and the Pentapolis, of Ethiopia, all Egypt, and all the East, Father of Fathers, Shepherd of Shepherds, Pontiff of Pontiffs, and thirteenth Apostle" (A. Fortescue, *The Uniate Eastern Churches*, p. 224). And when one looks back at e.g. the Nestorian controversy, it is somewhat startling and humorous to see violent opponents, accusing each other of heresy, addressing one another as "most pious," etc. (cf. Bright, *Age of the Fathers*, p. 274). For more than one reason it is a pity that the East was so fond of titles.

[66] See above, p. 236.

[67] But see R. Janin, Art., "Jean IV le Jeûneur," in *D.T.C.*

And later we shall see[68] the stupid and banal assumption—very significant all the same in its implications—of the description of Constantinople as the See of S. Andrew, "*the protoclete.*"

I am inclined to agree with a present-day Roman Catholic scholar who recently wrote: "I believe S. Gregory committed a blunder when he made so much fuss about the title 'œcumenical bishop,' which meant no more than 'patriarch.' For the most part those patriarchs had no chance of being too ambitious, as they were merely the ministers through whom the emperors governed the Eastern Church."[69]

If in the endless correspondence of Gregory about the offending title there is nowhere expressed the charge or complaint that John was encroaching on any peculiar privilege of the Roman see—and it is a fact that the charge is never once made[70]—it is not easy to see why Gregory got so agitated.

In these twelve or so letters of Gregory relative to the obnoxious title, what then was the motive?[71] In his letter to the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch (see below, p. 259), Gregory plainly tells them that the purpose of their fellow-patriarch of Constantinople is encroachment on their rights: to depress them, and to claim for himself exclusive power, and jurisdiction over all the Churches of the East. And this really seems the most likely key to his unceasing protests. The Epistles[72] of Gregory are all exhortations against pride and to humility; and he gives point to his remonstrances by conferring upon himself the title "*Servus Servorum Dei.*"

The title "patriarch" itself is at first quite loosely used.

[68] See above, note, p. 90.

[69] *The Papacy*, p. 51, Art. "The Patristic Period," by Dom. J. Chapman.

[70] The writer of the article "Gregorius I" in *D.C.B.* ii, 786 (J. Barmby) however, is of opinion that Gregory's vehemence was probably owing to his conviction that John IV's assumption of the title involved the assertion of supreme authority over the Church at large *and especially over the see of S. Peter;* Gregory's opponent, on the other hand, holding that it was simply a title of dignity and honour.

He makes an observation that in the different views is seen the difference of principle on which sees in the East and sees in the West grounded their pre-eminence. In the East it was the city's importance, "on which grounds alone," remarks he, "could any pre-eminence be claimed for Constantinople." In the West it was the apostolical origin of the see and its ancient purely ecclesiastical pre-eminence which counted. His comment, anyhow, is important: "Thus viewed this struggle of Gregory for the dignity of his own see against that of Constantinople assumes more importance than might at first seem due to it *as being a protest against the Erastianism of the East.*"

[71] cf. Pargoire, *Op. cit.*, p. 50. "*Et sans doute, en le prenant Jean IV ne revendique pas encore la suprématie sur le monde entier* (see also below p. 255); *mais s'il le prend n'est-ce point pour assurer un jour cette suprématie à son siège?*"

[72] *P. L.*, lxxvii. *Ep.* 739, 742, 746, 749, 771, 774, etc.

Its restricted use comes later. At first it is employed freely of any venerable bishop, and such a use is found down to the fourth century, e.g. S. Gregory Nazianzen speaks (*Orat.*, 42, 23) of " the older bishops, or to speak more suitably, the patriarchs."[73]

The title " patriarch," then, if not exactly common, was by no means severely restricted and rare. But there was always a consciousness that the bishops of three particular cities were of most importance in the hierarchy of the Church—Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch—and it was inevitable that the title of patriarch should come to be confined to them.

The Council of Nicæa, in Canon VI, simply made a rule of what had long been recognised in the Church.

" Let the *ancient* custom be maintained in Egypt, Libya and the Pentapolis that the Bishop of Alexandria have authority over all these places, just as is the custom for the Bishop of Rome. In the same way in Antioch and the other provinces the Churches shall keep their rights."

The pre-eminence of these sees was both owing to the fact that they were the three chief cities of the world, and also (as the *Decretum Gelasianum* shows) to the fact that they were all " Petrine "—they had directly or indirectly Peter as their founder, and no doubt also it was because each stood as the capital of a distinct section of the empire.[74]

[73] It is at an early date assigned to the Bishop of Hierapolis in Phrygia (Cumont, *Les Inscriptions Chrétiennes*, p. 50). The Bishops at Constantinople I (381) " set up patriarchs " (Socrates, *H. E.*, v. 8), " meaning apparently metropolitans of provinces " (Fortescue, Art. " Patriarchs," *Cath. Encycl.*). The designation is given to the metropolitans of Thessalonica (517), *P. G.*, cvii, 377, and Tyre (518) (Mansi, viii, 1083).

In the sixth century the term is still used. Celidonius, Bishop of Besançon, is termed " the venerable patriarch" (*Acta S.S.*, Feb. iii, 742, *Vita Roman* 2) and Nicetius of Lyons (567) is accorded the same title by Gregory of Tours (*Hist. Franc.*, v, xx) and it is given to his successor, Priscus (585), *P. L.*, lxxi, 341.

[74] A good deal is heard to-day of S. Paul's plan of always working from the great centres of civilisation. But the recognition of such a method and strategy is no new discovery. Nor is it particularly " Pauline." In this connection the words of Baronius are valuable, and they may also be read in reference to the remarks made above on the order of " Patriarchates " when dealing with the *Decretum Gelasianum* (p. 141). Baronius, *Annals*, A.D. 39, writes : " In the same way that Peter was sent by the Apostles to those who had believed in Christ in Samaria—as on a matter of great importance, and a mission worthy of the Prince of the Apostles—so, too, on the occasion of the conversion at Antioch of many Jews and Greeks to the Faith, and a Church being gathered there through the preaching of the disciples, who were dispersed abroad after the death of Stephen, we may well believe that it was the opinion of all the apostles that Peter, their chief, should preside as bishop over that city, which was the metropolis of all Syria, and to which Palestine, with Jerusalem itself, was subject. For we know that the course adopted from the earliest times in

The Bishop of Rome, then, was always recognised as the chief of the three patriarchs, and the Easterns, it must be remembered, so recognise him to-day. The question is whether the Easterns of those centuries recognised over and above his being the first of the patriarchs, any universal jurisdiction over the whole Church as "Pope." As "Patriarch" the Bishop of Rome ruled over his patriarchate, just as the Bishop of Alexandria ruled over his patriarchate. But the historical evidence we have brought forward shows that the Bishop of Rome claimed something over and above that; he claimed an oversight of the whole Church, that he was Patriarch of the patriarchs. One object of the present enquiry is to discover whether that claim was allowed and consistently acted upon.

With the foundation of Constantinople came the beginning of the rise of *her* bishops to patriarchal rank.

There were other factors besides the imperial residence and patronage and policy contributing to this.[75] The greater

creating ecclesiastical sees was to follow the division of the Roman provinces, according to their respective rank and dignity. Of this there are many examples; but it will suffice here to mention one or other; and first that of Alexandria, which bears intimately on the see of Antioch. For though the see of Antioch was erected by Peter before that of Alexandria in Peter's name, yet, because the prefecture of Alexandria, styled *Augustalis* by Augustus himself, and magnificently privileged by the emperor above others, far out-stripped the prefecture of Syria—evidently for this reason it was that the see of Alexandria, erected by Mark in Peter's name, was ranked before that of Antioch, though this latter see was the first created. In like manner, because the proconsulate of Syria was the first in rank of all the Eastern prefectures, the Church of Antioch, its metropolis, came to have the first place; and though the Church of Jerusalem had a claim to precedence on account of its origin and the great events accomplished in it, and its prerogatives might therefore be thought to excel those of the other Eastern Churches, yet that see was made subject to Antioch.

"It appears, moreover, that the Church of Jerusalem was not even the metropolitan see of Palestine; but because Cæsarea on the sea was the Roman metropolis of the entire province, its metropolitan see was also fixed in that city, whilst a certain honour was at the same time preserved to the Church of Jerusalem."

"Thus it was that Peter who had the primacy among the apostles, undertook the charge of the Church of Antioch, being at that time the first and of most importance. From ancient time the Catholic Church has been used to commemorate this event by the anniversary celebration of the Feast of S. Peter's Chair at Antioch on the 22nd February" (x, xi).

This further comment of Baronius is also of considerable weight: "The fact of the see of Alexandria—which there is no proof that Peter ever visited—being made by him the greatest of all after that of Rome, shows us plainly that it was not his presence, but his authority especially, that was necessary to constitute any church or patriarchal see." For, as Baronius previously remarks, if it had been Peter's presence that made a Primatial Church, there would have been as many patriarchal sees as there were Churches formed by the apostle—which would be doubtless many.

75 R. Janin, *Les Eglises Orientales*, p. 9. Pargoire, *Op. cit.*, pp. 31–32.

part of Africa became submerged in heresy, and Nestorianism and Monophysitism in various forms made great inroads on other provinces of the Church. Then later came Islam, making wide conquests,[76] and especially where heresy had been rife or held sway. But even the Moslem was not deceived by the grandeur of the Patriarch of Constantinople, his climbing to the second place, his bid for equality with the Western patriarch; or even his superiority to him. For apparently Photius came to think that with the transference of the imperial residence to Byzantium, all the glory of the old capital had been transferred too, and with it the primacy in the Church.

It appeared evidently to the Mohammedan that the Bishop of Rome was "pope" and held a position unique over all the Church.[77]

. . . . .

Constantinople, in spite of Canon XXVIII of Chalcedon being rejected by Leo, actually did hold the second place. It was a *fait accompli* in spite of the non-appearance of the canon in any code of Canon Law till the time of Photius. And one may speculate whether it would not have been better for subsequent centuries if the fact had been sooner recognised by the West, as it had to be, that Constantinople had *got* the second place.[78] Recognised or unrecognised *de jure*, at any rate, Constantinople held the second place *de facto* after the Council of Chalcedon. There were five patriarchates[79]—Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem (though these patriarchates did not exhaust the Catholic Church; there were also e.g. the autonomous Church of Cyprus, and, outside the Empire, the Church of Persia under the see of Seleucia-Ctesi-

[76] cf. Soloviev, *Op. cit.*, p. L. *Si l'on ne tenait pas compte du long travail antichrétien du Bas-Empire, il n'y aurait rien de plus surprenant que la facilité et la rapidité de la conquête musulmane. Cinq années suffirent pour réduire à une existence archéologique trois grands patriarcats de l'Eglise orientale. Il n'avait pas là de conversions à faire, il n'y avait qu'un ancien voile à déchirer.*

See also Robertson, ii, pp. 326–7.

[77] See a very interesting article in the *Revue de l'Orient Chrétien*: Arab witness to the primacy, "Relations officielles entre la cour romaine et les sultans Mamlouks d'Egypte," vol. viii (1903).

[78] Rome herself came at long last to recognise the position and the title. She gave it to the Latin patriarch she set up at Constantinople under Innocent III (1198–1216). At the Council of Florence (1439) she gave it to the Greek patriarch.

[79] Duchesne, *Churches Separated*, p. 112, "S. Gregory the Great announced his accession to the four Patriarchs of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem. This did not prevent him from keeping up, in his private correspondence, the old notion of the three Patriarchs (Rome, Alexandria and Antioch) seated on the same 'chair of S. Peter.'"

phon). But in the East, the Church of Constantinople quite overshadowed and eclipsed those of Alexandria and Antioch, owing to the causes already shown.

. . . . . .

To the title of " patriarch," gradually confined to the Bishops of Rome, Alexandria and Antioch, there grew up the custom of sometimes prefixing the laudatory term " œcumenical " to emphasise the restriction.

The first instance of its use is its application at the Latrocinium to Dioscorus by Olympios, Bishop of Evaza,[80] but at Chalcedon he repented publicly for using it.[81] The same term is used for popes. At the Council of Chalcedon, e.g. Leo is addressed as " œcumenical archbishop and patriarch of Great Rome."[82] Pope Hormisdas in 517 is addressed in the same way[83] by the monks and archimandrites of Syria Secunda; and Pope Agapetus, *c.* 535, as we have observed, receives a letter from the archimandrites of Constantinople, Syria, Palestine and other districts addressed " to our Master, the most holy and blessed archbishop of old Rome, and œcumenical patriarch."[84]

But the term " œcumenical " is not confined to the popes. It is used particularly of the Bishop of Constantinople.[85] The Emperor Justinian, as was noted above (p. 236), commonly uses the term of the Bishop of Constantinople in his laws and edicts,[86] while Mennas, in the Council of Constantinople, 536, is mentioned in the Acts of the Council as " œcumenical patriarch."[87]

This is enough to show that when John the Faster used the title for himself in 588, he was using a term neither original nor revolutionary.

What, then, was the significance and implication of the term? It could not have meant " universal " in the fullest sense of the word, for otherwise the Westerns would not have waited till the year 588 to protest against its use (it had certainly not become then, what apparently Photius much later intended it

[80] Mansi, vi, 855, *Universalis archiepiscopus.*
[81] Le Quien *Oriens Christianus*, i, 733.
[82] Mansi, vi, 100, 1012 and 1029. See Robertson, ii, p. 328. Gregory " also states (probably in error) that the title had been offered to the Bishop of Rome at the Council of Chalcedon and refused." J. Barmby, Art. " Gregorius I," *D.C.B.* ii, p. 785.
[83] Mansi, viii, 425.
[84] Mansi, viii, 895.
[85] See e.g. Mansi, viii, 1038, 1042, 1058, 1094, 1066, 1067.
[86] e.g. *Cod. Justin*, iv, lex 34, Nov. iii, v, vi, xvi, lv, lvi, lvii.
[87] e.g. Mansi, viii, 926.

to become), and, after all, if the Easterns were giving the honorific title to the patriarch of Constantinople, they were, as we have seen, equally giving it to the patriarch of Rome; and they could not both be at once "universal" patriarchs in the widest sense. "It was not supposed that there was any incompatibility between the titles, when, at the council under Mennas, which condemned the opinions of Origen, the Bishops of Rome and Constantinople were each styled 'archbishop' and 'œcumenical patriarch,' or when Justinian addressed each of them as 'head of all the churches.'"[88] Dom Chapman (quoted above, p. 250) seems entirely right when he says that "universal bishop" was only another way of saying "patriarch." Substitute the word "Catholic" for œcumenical, as is so often done to-day when one speaks, e.g. of the "Catholicos" of the Syrian Church, and one gets some idea of what was meant. It meant the undisputed head of a great church, recognised everywhere.[89]

Why, then, did the Westerns make all the "fuss"? It would seem because they feared a tendency for Constantinople to absorb the rights, privileges and jurisdiction, and not only the dignity, of Alexandria and Antioch and Jerusalem—for the intention of the patriarch of Constantinople was evidently to restrict the title, hitherto used of others, to himself alone.

When, however, John the Faster, the patriarch of Constantinople, in 588, sat in judgment on Gregory, patriarch of Antioch,[90] and called himself "œcumenical patriarch," using a term which had frequently been bestowed on his predecessors by others but apparently (if the superscriptions of two letters of the patriarch John II are a later interpolation) never by themselves, it is by no means certain that Pope Pelagius II and Gregory the Great saw in this step—the using of the title by himself of himself—an encroachment by the patriarch of Constantinople on the unique position of the see of Rome.[91]

[88] Robertson, *Op. cit*, ii, 328.

[89] But see also Fortescue, Art. "Patriarch," *Cath. Ency.*, against this R. Janin, Art. "Jean le Jeûneur," *D.T.C.*

Robertson, *Op. cit.*, p. 377, "The meaning of this term in Byzantine usage was indefinite; there was certainly no intention of claiming by it a jurisdiction over the whole Church," etc.

[90] The acts of this assembly unfortunately have not survived. The letters of Gregory show that his predecessor, Pope Pelagius, protested at once against the use of the title in the documents (Mansi, ix, 1214).

[91] It is only right to give another estimate and answer to this not easy question. *Que signifiait au juste ce mot œcuménique? La plupart l'interprétaient dans le sens de patriarche universel, supérieur à tous les évêques de la chrétienté. C'est ainsi que l'entendirent les papes, ils ne purent tolérer cette prétention. Le bibliothécaire Anastase, qui fut envoyé comme légat au*

John the Faster was a good and holy man—that is conceded—and it is difficult to accuse him of personal ambition.[92] Yet apparently Gregory was uneasy lest John was claiming to be patriarch over the whole world. "If one patriarch is called universal, the name is taken away from the others."[93]

The popes themselves even never used "œcumenical patriarch" of themselves—they as patriarchs were but patriarchs of the West—although, "Who doubts," Gregory asks, "that the Church of Constantinople is subject to the Apostolic See? Indeed, the most pious Lord Emperor and our brother the bishop of that city both equally acknowledge this." *P. L.*, lxxvii, 957. "*I know of no bishop who is not subject to the Apostolic See*" (Mansi, x, 155).

Gregory ascended the Chair of Peter in 590, and as we have seen, he viewed things as his predecessor, Pelagius II. However, when he sent his synodal letters to John the Faster, he made no allusion by letter to this vexed question of the title, but relied on the verbal expostulations of his apocrisiaries at Constantinople. While he admitted the representatives which

septième grand concile, fit à ce sujet des remonstrances aux évêques orientaux. Les Grecs lui répondirent que ce titre n'impliquait pas pour le patriarche la suprématie du monde tout entier, mais seulement l'autorité exercée sur une partie du monde catholique. Nous ne savons si ces raisons satisfirent pleinement Anastase, mais il nous semble que les Orientaux se jouèrent un peu de la crédulité du prélat italien. Il était facile de demander si œcuménique était le synonyme de catholique, pourquoi les évêques d'Alexandrie, d'Antioche, et leurs suffragants mêmes ne prenaient pas aussi ce titre." As a matter of fact, however, as we have pointed out above, it had been used of them (see p. 254).

The critic's estimate of the significance of the title Œcumenical Patriarch is interesting, and he comments, "*Les papes voyant le patriarche garder le titre œcuménique, se l'attribuèrent à eux-mêmes.*" He points out that Pope Agatho took it at the sixth General Council and that his legates sign, "Legates of Agatho, Œcumenical Patriarch."

Dr. Fortescue (note p. 43 *Orthodox Eastern Church*) maintains, however: "The Pope is not Œcumenical Patriarch, and has never called himself so, although in addresses to him the title 'universal pope' has sometimes been used." It may have been a gift of foresight as to what it would prove that made him denounce so hotly this satanic arrogance and to characterise the user of such a title as the precursor of Antichrist. To quote this critic again: "*Ne croyons pas que ce titre fut pour les patriarches d'Orient une vaine formule destinée à contenter un amour-propre exigeant, mais sans portée réelle. Il était pour eux le signe de la suprématie et de la prééminence. Constantinople est au-dessus de tous les autres sièges, dit Balsamon* (*Nomocanon*, i, 5) parce qu'elle possède le sceptre de l'empire romain. '*Elle est la tête de toutes les églises . . . . Elle joint des prérogatives qu'avait l'ancienne Rome' ajoute le Nomocanon.*" (See Gasquet, *Op. cit.*, p. 113, *seq.*)

[92] At his death in 595 his sole possessions were a wooden bedstead, an old coverlet and a ragged cloak, which the Emperor had taken to the imperial palace and preserved as sacred relics.

[93] *P. L.*, lxxvii, 740.

the patriarch had at Rome to communion, he forbade the same course to his own agents at Constantinople, though there was no difference on the score of doctrine between the two Churches.

The matter was brought to an issue by troubles with which the patriarch John had to deal at Constantinople. Two of his clergy had appealed from him to the pope. John, priest of Chalcedon, had been condemned for holding the heresy of Marcion; and Anastasius, a monk, on a similar count, as being tainted with Manichæism. And in addition to conviction, Anastasius had suffered what was a new and uncanonical punishment, Gregory remonstrated—he had been beaten with cudgels in S. Sophia. Pope Gregory demanded the documents of the council that condemned them to be sent to him, and when John the patriarch replied that he did not know what the pope was asking about, Gregory sternly answered that to tell the truth was more important than the abstaining from meat—(" wouldn't it be better to see meat enter your mouth than to witness false speech come out of it? ")—and that if he really did not know, he must be a bad shepherd to be unaware of what was happening in his flock.[94]

Gregory held a council to enquire into the case of John the priest of Chalcedon,[95] and the accused was declared innocent. Although his accusers were present, they could not substantiate the charges against him; in fact, they did not know what " Marcionism " was. To John the Faster, the pope then wrote that the case had been carefully and minutely examined, and the accused had been found perfectly orthodox, the sentence of the judges had been set aside, and he declared John " to be Catholic and free from any crime of heresy."[96]

John was sent back to Chalcedon and the pope requested the patriarch to see that he had every welcome and protection against his traducers. He wrote to the same purpose to the Emperor Marcian and to Theoctistus; and when Cyriacus

[94] *P. L.*, lxxvii, 647, 648, *seq.* Pargoire, *Op. cit.*, p. 46.

[95] Mansi, x, 475.

[96] Pope Gregory wrote to the Patriarch: " Since after a very minute examination made in council we were unable to find in the priest John any matter of guilt, and above all, since the *libellus* he presented to the judges by your deputies is in every point in accord with orthodox doctrine, we disapproved of the sentence of these judges, and in our decision declared John Catholic and exempt from all crime of heresy."

The writer (J. Barmby) of the article "Gregorius I," in *D. C. B.*, writes: " Though the tone of his letters on this occasion was one of brotherly remonstrance rather than of authority, yet his proceeding implied the right of reversing at Rome what had been done at Constantinople and a power of interference, such as he did undoubtedly claim, as his predecessors had done." Vol. ii, p. 785.

succeeded John the Faster, he wrote to him also to the same effect.[97]

Anastasius, the other priest who had appealed to the pope, had likewise been deposed on a charge of heresy by his patriarch John after judges had sat and investigated the case. It seems that Anastasius had under provocation been guilty of some fault, but what particularly seems to have moved the patriarch was the possession of a book containing heretical propositions. Anastasius appealed to the Apostolic See, he protested his orthodoxy, his adherence to the teaching and decrees of the four Œcumenical Councils, and his acceptance of the condemnation of the Three Chapters.

Gregory had the incriminating book sent to him, and found that it was indeed full of errors and heretical sentiments, but the accused protested that, though he had read it, it was clean contrary to what he himself held.

The pope was satisfied and convinced of his sincerity, and ordered him to be restored to his monastery and office therein. Cyriacus had now succeeded John as patriarch,[98] and the pope promised to announce to him his decision. At present it would not be right—seeing that he had not yet received from the new patriarch the synodal letters.[99]

To Cyriacus, the new patriarch, then, Gregory wrote in due course, urging, as he had upon his predecessor in the former case, the welcome restoration of the vindicated.[100] Anastasius profited by the pope's care and solicitude, and eventually became archimandrite of the monastery of S. Mary at Jerusalem.

To go back a little—there had been considerable delay in sending the documents of these two cases demanded by the pope. And in the meantime the patriarch by means of the Empress Constantia asked of the pope relics of SS. Peter and Paul. Gregory saw in this merely calculated worrying.[101]

The Acts of the Council at length reached Rome (594) and the pope then knew why there had been so much delay; the documents were redolent of "œcumenical patriarch." Gregory thereupon wrote letters of protest to John, to Sabinianus, his apocrisiary, to the Emperor Maurice, and to the Empress—against "this proud title," "this profane title"—and he vowed that if he wrote again it would not be in so patient a spirit

[97] Mansi, x, 50.

[98] John the Faster used the title till his death (Greg. *Ep.* vii, 4. *P. L.*, lxxvii, 857).

[99] Mansi, x, 45. See below also, p. 364.

[100] Mansi, x, 51.

[101] *P. L.*, lxxvii, 704.

as before, " *nam de subsequenti talis alia transmittetur, de qua ejus superbia non laetetur.*"[102]

Gregory (and this is important in trying to see his point of view and to discover his motives) emphasises the fact that not even Peter is called " universal apostle."

" For to all who know the Gospel it is apparent that by the Lord's voice the care of the whole Church was committed to the holy apostle and Prince of all the apostles, Peter. For to him it is said, ' Peter, lovest thou Me more than these,' etc. Lo, he received the keys of the heavenly kingdom, and the power to bind and loose is given him, the care and principality of the whole Church is committed to him, and yet he *is not called the universal apostle.*"[103]

To John the Faster the pope writes at great length, and the burden is ever the same—an entreaty to humility by laying aside a title so bound to be a stumbling-block to the patriarch himself and to all. And Gregory writes also to the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch, Eulogius and Anastasius, on the same theme.

The patriarch of Antioch was a great friend of Gregory's and he ventured to tell the pope that the matter need be no cause of offence. But Gregory reminded Anastasius how the Church of Byzantium had often been the home of heresiarchs, and if one bishop was called universal and this " universal " one fell, the whole Church would be involved, which would be an absurd position.[104]

The East was really unmoved, or rather, it seems that it hardened all the more in its determination to stick to the use of the title, feeling that the pope's fears were unreasonable and groundless ; and in all the letters of affection and regard which reached Gregory from Constantinople and elsewhere, there was not the least indication of a desire of going back upon the past.

The policy of forbidding his apocrisiaries to take part in religious offices at Constantinople with the Easterns, which he had formulated against John, was extended to the new patriarch Cyriacus. When Eulogius, the patriarch of Alexandria, in his reply to Gregory, for some reason or other (was it to show his personal belief in the unimportance of the question ?)

[102] *P. L.*, lxxvii, 743. *Ep.* 19. Other expressions the pope uses which show his abhorrence of the title are " pestiferous," " wicked," a " diabolical " assumption. Only with the pride of Lucifer could the ambition of one who assumed it be compared, and it was plainly a sign of the coming of Anti-christ, the king of pride.

[103] *P. L.*, lxxvi, 745.

[104] *P. L.*, 882, *Ep.* 27. Anastasius apparently looked on the title as merely honorific, not unsuitable to the patriarch of the imperial city.

designated Gregory as "universal pope," Gregory was much displeased and protested that if he refused the title to others, it was not that he might arrogate it to himself (*ibid.*, col. 933) for in attributing to himself all the honour of the episcopate, he would take away the same from the other bishops.

When the Emperor Maurice was murdered (602), Gregory, unaware of the details of his death, saw the hand of Providence in the succession of his supplanter Phocas, but the advent of the new ruler hardly merited the encomiums of Gregory ;[105] though indeed the people of Italy had a more untroubled time under Phocas than under Maurice.

Gregory's correspondence with Cyriacus and Phocas seems not to have been entirely fruitless, for the *Liber Pontificalis*, referring to Boniface III, says : "*Hic obtinuit apud Phocam principem ; ut sedes apostolica beati Petri apostoli caput esset omnium ecclesiarum, id est Romana ecclesia, quia ecclesia Constantinopolitana se primam omnium ecclesiarum scribebat.*"

As has been said above, there is nothing in any of Gregory's letters to support the contention that the *primacy* of Rome was in dispute—the only explanation of these words then is that they refer to his efforts against the use of the title, to him so offensive, of "œcumenical patriarch." But whether or no the title was in abeyance for a space, certain it is that after the death of Phocas, the title comes into common use. All Gregory's remonstrances proved fruitless, and the East ended by becoming more determined than ever to cling to the use of a title that had been consecrated by the tradition of so many years.[106]

If one may make a slight digression, it is to be remarked that the writer to whom we have referred, who is inclined to think that the primacy of Rome was in dispute, makes, however, this comment : "It certainly would not have been well for the Church had the spiritual authority of the Bishop of Rome accrued to the subservient patriarchs of the Eastern capital."[107]

There is this to be noted in conclusion. In all this tedious controversy there is recognition of the primacy of Rome.

John the Faster shows it by sending to Gregory the documents relating to the trial of John, priest of Chalcedon, and the monk Anastasius, when these condemned by his council had made their appeals to Rome.

[105] Gibbon has some severe strictures on Gregory's civilities to Phocas. And see Milman, i, 460–3.

[106] See Art. "Eglise de Constantinople," *D. T. C.*, ii, 1133.

[107] Art. "Gregorius I," *D. C. B.*, ii.

The same belief is evident on the part of Cyriacus, the successor in the see of Constantinople, and of the Emperor Maurice; and Eulogius, the Patriarch of Alexandria, sends Gregory a letter which leaves nothing to be desired in respect of the setting forth of the primacy of Rome.[108]

It is interesting to notice to-day the Easterns in their service-books thus address S. Gregory:

> "Thou, most holy Pastor, art the successor to the See and also to the zeal of the *coryphæus*, cleansing the people and bringing them to God. *Successor to the throne of the Prince of the Choir of the disciples*, thou dost fulfil thine office; and from thence, O Gregory, thou dost by thy word as with a torch enlighten the faithful."
>
> "The first of Churches, having embraced thee, waters every land that is under the sun with the streams of her most holy teachings. Hail, torch of religion, who dost light up all the world with the rays of thy words! Beacon, calling back to the haven those tossed among the waves of error, and ransoming them from death. *Organ acted upon by the breath of the Holy Ghost.*"[109]

[108] *P. L.*, lxxvii, 898.
[109] Nilles, *Kalendarium*, i, 121.

CHAPTER XIII

THE MONOTHELITE CONTROVERSY AND THE SIXTH GENERAL COUNCIL : CONSTANTINOPLE III, 680–681

When the disturbance consequent on the question of the Three Chapters had nearly subsided, fresh dissension arose from the heated discussions as to whether Our Lord possessed one will or two.[1]

If the controversy had been confined to the theological domain, it would have been looked upon as a secondary question in the Monophysite dispute. But politics again entered to give the controversy an unexpected importance and field.

Just as in the previous controversy of the Three Chapters the motive of the Emperor Justinian was the uniting of the empire, so here again the Emperor Heraclius, harassed alternately by the Persians and the Arabs, had the same object in view, and for this reason: the disaffected Monophysites instead of repelling his enemies might welcome them. For at present he was waging war in Syria against the Persians, and the disloyal Syrian Monophysites could constitute a great source of danger to the integrity of the empire.[2]

He sought therefore a formula for reconciling them and the orthodox, and he thought he had found it when there was produced the thesis that Jesus Christ, though possessing two Natures, yet had only one Will and Operation (ἓν θέλημα μία ἐνέργεια). As a consequence of a disputation held in his

[1] "Whether the Monothelite controversy was of equal importance (*sc.* with the Nestorian and Eutychian controversies, the toleration of either of which heresies would have involved the surrender of the Nicene faith) may be a matter of doubt; but at least it was not a mere logomachy. The contending parties knew perfectly well what they were fighting about; and a careless reader who pronounces the controversy to be either unmeaning or unintelligible, will be wiser if he takes a little more trouble to wrestle with the terms and phrases in dispute before he finally adopts this conclusion," W. R. Clark's (Editor's) Preface to Hefele, v, p. 6.

[2] As Robertson (p. 422) remarks: "Heraclius in the course of his Persian wars saw cause to regret the policy by which the Nestorians had been alienated from the empire, and to desire that the evils which were likely to result from the schism of the Monophysites might be averted."

presence in Armenia, 622, Heraclius had asked Cyrus, Bishop of Phasis, whether " one operation " was correct.[3] Cyrus, in doubt, asked Sergius, Patriarch of Constantinople, who replied that he half thought it was, and gave as his ground a quotation from a *supposed*[4] letter of his predecessor Mennas to Pope Vigilius, in which " one operation " occurred.

Cyrus became Orthodox Patriarch of Alexandria (630) and by means of the compromising formula did indeed reconcile many Monophysites to the Church. But, as the heretics boasted, " We have not gone to Chalcedon, Chalcedon has come to us."[5]

The reconciliation at Alexandria produced considerable rejoicing at Constantinople, and Heraclius and Sergius wrote warmly to congratulate Cyrus.[6] However, there happened to be at Alexandria a Palestinian monk, Sophronius (afterwards Patriarch of Jerusalem, 634–638), with a great reputation for sanctity and learning. He vigorously protested against the teaching as being contrary to Chalcedon, and the result of his opposition was that Cyrus suggested that Sophronius should go to Constantinople and state his objections to Sergius.

He did so, and Sergius, much impressed, withdrew μία ἐνέργεια and wrote to Pope Honorius for advice.

Some think that the letter of Sergius was deceitful.[7] Dom. Chapman is surely much nearer the mark, that Sergius was honestly puzzled. And this is the opinion of the learned writer of the article " Honorius I " in the *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*, E. Amann.[8]

[3] He did not invent the term. The doctrine of μία ἐνέργεια had been put forth long before this. See Hefele, v, 5.

[4] In the third session of the Council they were found to be spurious, and the papal legates made strong protests against the epistles attributed to Mennas and Vigilius. On Monothelitism, see Tixeront, *Histoire des Dogmes*, iii, 160–892. Pohle-Preuss, *Christology*, p. 154, *seq.* Pargoire, *L'Eglise Byzantine*, 157–166. Ottley, *Doctrine of the Incarnation*, 447–458. Funk, *Manual of Church History*, i, 163–866. Bardenhewer, *Patrology*, 564. Robertson, p. 421.

[5] Mansi, xi, 561.

[6] cf. Mansi, xi, 562. Hefele, v, 18. Mansi, x, 971.

[7] e.g. Hefele, v, and Pohle-Preuss, *Christology*, 155, and C. Coupe, *The Alleged failures of Infallibility*, p. 11.

[8] *The Condemnation of Pope Honorius*, p. 15. " Hefele says (p. 27, note), ' One can see he was a Monothelite, and wanted to mislead the pope.' I think it clear, on the contrary, that he was puzzled by an involved problem and wished to get the Pope's help. He seems to have done his best to think and act rightly, but he was no more exempt from error than was a Cyprian or an Aquinas."

D. T. C., p. 99, " *Au préalable, il faut remarquer que la bonne foi de Sergius dans cette affaire n'est pas contestable. Les évènements précédents 'lont montré anxieux de concilier les scrupules de son orthodoxie avec le souci de plaire à l'empereur. Il croyait avoir trouvé un moyen d'y parvenir. Sa conscience eât été pleinement en repos si la plus haute autorité de l'Eglise avait*

It is impossible to deal with the history of Pope Honorius without entering to some extent into the field of controversy. The literature relating to Honorius and his alleged heresy, and its bearing on papal claims, is endless.

But, in fairness, before appraising the significance of the case of this pope on the relations of the Eastern Churches to the see of Rome—before enquiring what light it throws on what view the Greeks took of their position with regard to the see of Rome and its occupant—one ought to point out the following :

(1) If the Easterns condemn Honorius, they must also condemn, in his measure and degree, their own patriarch Sergius in a sense the cause of the trouble. "We anathematise Sergius . . . . Cyrus of Alexandria and with them Honorius, formerly Bishop of Rome, who *followed* them"[9] (ὡς ἐκείνοις ἐν τούτοις ἀκολουθήσαντα.) And, as Pargoire quite fairly says of the Byzantine episcopate, "*Trop heureux de clouer un évêque de l'ancienne Rome au pilori qui réclamait quatre des plus récents pasteurs de la Rome nouvelle, il inscrivit Honorius à la suite de Sergius, de Paul, de Pyrrhus, et de Pierre, sans presque marquer de différence entre eux et lui, tant et si bien qu'un jour devait luire* où les Byzantins regarderaient ce pontife romain comme le premier père, comme le seul auteur responsable du monothélisme."[10]

(2) Controversy has raged, even amongst Roman Catholics, as to whether Honorius was or was not heretical. "Did the letters of Honorius contain heresy? Most assuredly not! The letters were entirely orthodox," so says one writer, quite unequivocally.[11] On the other hand, Hefele maintains "that, however, the Sixth Œcumenical Council actually condemned Honorius on account of heresy, is clear beyond all doubt" (vol. v, p. 182), and he goes on to give a number of extracts from the documents of the synod witnessing supports of his contention. A third authority writes: "Unquestionably no Catholic has the right to deny that Honorius was a heretic (though in the sense that Origen and Theodore of Mopsuestia were heretics), a heretic in words if not in intention."[12] Another says: "It is almost critically demonstrable that such Monothelitish phraseology as he uses, he uses with an orthodox mean-

voulu approuver son attitude." But cf. Pargoire, who says of Sergius and his desire to find a formula of union, "*s'il était homme de l'Eglise il était aussi et surtout homme d'Etat*" (p. 157) says of this, "*une lettre bien faite pour le circonvenir*" (p. 159, *Op. cit.*).

[9] Mansi, xi, 664.

[10] cf. *ibid*, p. 159, *Sergius de Constantinople en était l'âme*, etc.

[11] C. Coupe, *The Alleged Failures of Infallibility*, p. 12.

[12] Chapman, *The Condemnation of Pope Honorius*, p. 116.

ing."[13] "*Ce que fut la faute d'Honorius nul n'ignore. Orthodoxe dans l'âme, orthodoxe lorsqu'il écrivait ; la nature divine opère dans le Christ ce qui est divin et la nature humaine ce qui est humain*" (Mansi, xi, 580). "*Ce pape commit la maladresse de se donner les apparences d'un hérétique en employant la formule* d'une volonté *dans un sens équivoque et en s'abstenant d'approuver la formule des* deux énergies. *Pour cette conduite, si avantageuse en fait au monothélisme, Honorius méritait bien quelque blâme et vigoureux. On pouvait lui reprocher avec saint Léon II ' de n'avoir pas, comme il convenait à l'autorité apostolique, éteint la flamme naissante de l'hérésie, et même de l'avoir favorisée par sa négligence.'* "[14] And once more: "He said nothing heretical," writes Dr. Fortescue, "and no later pope would ever admit that he had."[15]

John, his secretary, and the real author of his letters, declared before he died in what sense the incriminated passages were to be understood. Pope John IV took pains to expound to the Emperor Constantine III what was the true doctrine of his predecessor.[16] The Abbot Maximus, the Confessor in the controversy, attested the same in his conference with Pyrrhus, in a letter to Peter, and in a treatise addressed to Marinus.

I myself do not believe that Honorius was ever a Monothelite. He starts with the Hypostatic Union, and when he uses the phrase *una voluntas* with approval, the context makes it clear that the expression is to be taken *morally*, not physically. Christ's human nature agrees (in this sense, i.e. is one) with His Divine Will. And this rather proves his belief in a two-fold will.[17] Besides, he makes his own the words of the Tome of Leo.

Honorius' mind was far better than his words, and he little dreamt of the trouble that his two letters were going to cause in the Church long after he was laid in the grave—that more than forty years after his death he would be condemned for them by a General Council.[18]

(3) Whether the doctrine of "Papal Infallibility" be true

[13] Ryder, *Catholic Controversy*, p. 30.

[14] Pargoire, *Op. cit.*, pp. 198–9.

[15] Fortescue, *Lesser Eastern Churches*, p. 211. cf. also Funk, *Manual of Church History*, i, p. 211, and Tixeront, *Histoire des Dogmes*, i, p. 188, and the exhaustive art. "Honorius," in *D. T. C.*, by E. Amann, p. 96, *seq.*

[16] Mansi, x, 682. Robertson, p. 437.

[17] The whole matter is most fairly discussed by Hefele in his "Author's Preface" of vol. v. (enlarged edition) the whole of which is most weighty and valuable. See also pp. 34 *ibid.*, and cf. p. 194 and 55.

[18] Funk, *Op. cit.*, says: "Hence the judgment pronounced by the Council of Constantinople was much too severe," p. 166.

or not, the case of Honorius really has nothing to do with it.[19] For even if the defence be made that the letters were private letters (though such a defence would rule out three-fourths of papal documents on which theologians rely) they cannot be said to have been written by Honorius as "Pope"; *he did not address the Universal Church.* He *defined* nothing, and these are conditions necessary for a decree to be accounted by a Roman Catholic "infallible." And it is not held by Roman Catholics that a pope cannot as a private doctor teach heresy,[20] but only, not *as pope* when he is teaching deliberately the whole Church.[21]

(4) *What he was condemned for was, that he had omitted to define the truth*—not that he had taught error.[22] And this is made manifest by Pope Leo II, who confirmed the council. In a letter to the Spanish bishops he gives the reason "*Qui flammam haeretici dogmatis non, ut decuit apostolicam auctoritatem, incipientem extinxit, sed negligendo confovit.*" Or, again, in his letter to the Emperor Constantine Pogonatus, "*Qui hanc apostolicam ecclesiam non apostolicae traditionis doctrina lustravit, sed profana proditione immaculatam fidem subvertere conatus est* (παρεχώρησε=*subverti permisit*).[23]

(5) Whatever the council which condemned Honorius said, they took care to have it ratified by his successor on the papal throne, whom they describe as "*Peter*" (e.g. "by Agatho Peter spoke," etc.).[24] And presumably the same designation

[19] It must, however, in justice be said that with this Hefele does not agree. He writes, p. 61: "On the question whether the two letters of Honorius were put forth *ex cathedra*, as it is called, or not, the views among his defenders are very different. Pennacchi maintains that they were put forth *auctoritate apostolica* (i, *c.* p. 169, *seq.*), whilst Schneemann (i, *c.* S. 63) holds the opposite opinion. For my own part, I confess myself here on the side of Pennacchi, since Honorius intended to give first to the Church of Constantinople, and *implicite* to the whole Church, an instruction on doctrine and faith; and in his second letter he even uses the expression *Ceterum, quantum ad DOGMA ECCLESIASTICUM pertinet . . . . non unam sed duas operationes in mediatore Dei et hominum definire debemus.*"

[20] See Ryder, *Catholic Controversy*, p. 30. "It has always been maintained by Catholic theologians that for heresy the Church may judge the pope because, as most maintain, by heresy he ceases to be pope," etc.

[21] See the Decree of the Vatican Council, 1870.

[22] cf. Chapman, *The First Eight General Councils*, p. 61. "He had not addressed the Church, and above all, he had not bound all Christians to accept his definition. Nay, he had defined nothing, but had *refused to define.*"

The same patristic authority in his Art. "Honorius," in *Cath. Encycl.*, says: "The letter cannot be called a private one, for it is an official reply to a formal consultation. It had, however, less publicity than a modern encyclical." See also note p. 438, Robertson, ii, *Op. cit.*

[23] Hefele-Leclercq, iii, 519.

[24] Mansi, xi, 666, and see below, p. 353.

applied to his predecessor Honorius? Their complaint and condemnation therefore was tantamount to this, that he had not "lived up to" it; he had not "walked worthy of his vocation." He had not acted *as Peter.*

. . . . .

Honorius died in 638,[25] so unfortunately he never had the opportunity of seeing Heraclius' Ecthesis—neither did he foresee what a great fire his little flame would kindle.

He seems, contrary to the general idea, to have been a pontiff of great parts and virtues. "*Erat enim venerabilis praesul Honorius sagax animo, vigens consilio, doctrina clarus, dulcedine et humilitate pollens,*" says Jonas of Bobbio.[26]

It was no easy task that the letter sent by Sergius had given to Honorius. The situation was a delicate one; for the case of Vigilius would remind him of the danger of being embroiled in the interminable disputes on theological points so dear to the Greek mind. Thus he sends his letter, "*la déplorable réponse . . . ce monument de bonne foi surprise et de naïveté confiante,*"[27] and feebly forbids the use of either "one will" or "two wills."

"We must not wrest what they say into Church dogmas." "We leave the matter to grammarians." "We must not define either one or two operations." "So that those who are under age may not, taking offence at the expression *two energies,* hold us for Nestorians, and that (on the other side) we may not seem to simple ears to teach Eutychianism, when we clearly confess only *one* energy." "We must not by definition declare either one or two operations."

My conclusion therefore is that when he was condemned Honorius was condemned, *not* for defining, but for *not defining,* for *omission rather than commission.*[28]

. . . . .

The history of the Monothelite controversy (whatever view one takes of Honorius—that of Pennacchi or Hefele or Protestant writers) gives instances again and again of the clearness with which the primacy and leadership of the see of Rome was acknowledged by the Eastern Churches.

[25] Sophronius also died in 638. The Ecthesis was issued at the end of 638. Sergius died December, 638.

[26] *P. L.*, lxxxvii, 1063, *Liber Pontificalis.* De Rossi gives the epitaph on his tomb (*Inscriptiones Christianae,* ii, 127). Hefele says, vol. v, 28, "certainly his friendliness and amiability (*dulcedo* and *humilitas*) towards others, especially towards the Emperor and Patriarch of Constantinople, contributed to land him in error."

[27] Pargoire, p. 159.

[28] *Apparently the outside world only knew of the letters long after his death.* See the whole letter in Hefele, v, 28–32.

Sophronius, now Patriarch of Jerusalem, in a very striking letter, his "*Epistola Synodica,*"[29] speaks of the Tome of Leo as:

> "The God-given and inspired letter which has for author the illustrious and saintly Leo, the light of the Roman church, or rather, of The Church. A letter which he wrote evidently under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit . . . . to the bishop of the royal city, Flavian . . . . Besides these letters and these inspired words *I accept all his teachings and his letters as proceeding from the mouth of Peter, the Coryphæus. I kiss them, venerate them, and accept them with all my soul.*"

He goes on to say that he receives all the writings of Cyril of Alexandria, "the all-wise"

> "and whatever Leo, the most holy pastor of the most holy Church of the Romans has written,"

especially against Nestorius and Eutyches, and then he emphasises the Petrine privilege of Rome when he continues:

> "I recognise the latter as definitions of Peter and the former as those of Mark,"

since, as the *Decretum Gelasianum* made manifest, the status of Alexandria was owing to its indirectly "Petrine" rank.

But further evidence of what this Eastern patriarch thought of the prerogatives of the Bishop of Rome is supplied by a touching incident in which Sophronius himself and Stephen, Bishop of Dor, were concerned. The latter wrote an account of it and presented it to Pope Martin I at his Lateran Council of 619.[30]

Sophronius, in the course of his fight against Monothelitism, determined to send Stephen of Dor (the "first in the jurisdiction of Jerusalem," as the latter describes himself) to the Pope, "about this matter alone to this Apostolic and Great See." The patriarch took Stephen to the Hill of Calvary, and there, on that most sacred spot, he laid on him the charge of making this journey to Rome, which the Saracen invasion made impossible for himself.

> "Thou shalt give account," he said, "to the God Who on this holy spot was willingly crucified in the flesh for us, at His glorious and dread appearing, when He shall come to judge the living and the dead, if thou delay, and allow His faith to be endangered."

[29] Mansi, xi, 461–509. *Revue de l'Orient Chrétien*, Art. on "Sophrone," by S. Vailhé, 1902 and 1903. Hefele-Leclercq, iii, p. 375.

[30] Mansi, x, 893, and see below, p. 273.

And then Sophronius continued with these remarkable words :

" Traverse quickly all the world from one end to the other *until you come to the Apostolic See, where are the foundations of the orthodox doctrine,* make clearly known to the most holy personages of that throne the questions agitated among us. Cease not to pray and to beg them until their apostolic and Divine wisdom shall have pronounced the victorious judgment and destroyed from the foundation . . . . the new heresy."

And that these were the sentiments also of Stephen himself, he shows by the passages in this document presented to Pope Martin, where, speaking of himself, he says :

" For this cause sometimes . . . . we asked for the wings of a dove . . . . that we might fly away and announce these things *to the Chair which rules and presides over all, I mean to Yours, the head and the highest,* for the healing of the whole wound. For this it has been accustomed to do with power from of old, and *from the beginning by its canonical or apostolical authority,* because alone apart from the rest the truly great Peter, head of the apostles, was clearly thought worthy not only to be entrusted with the keys of heaven, to open it worthily to believers, but to close it justly to those who disbelieve the Gospel of grace. Moreover, that he first was commissioned to feed the sheep of the whole Catholic Church ; for ' Peter,' said He, ' Lovest thou Me ? ' ' Feed my sheep.' And again, because he had in a manner peculiar and special, a faith in the Lord stronger than all and unchangeable, to convert and to confirm his fellows and spiritual brethren when tossed about, he had power and sacerdotal authority as having been adorned by God Himself, Incarnate for us."

Stephen of Dor not only felt the responsibility of the charge so solemnly laid upon him by Sophronius, but he says that :

" *I was urged by the requests of almost all the pious Bishops of the East* in agreement with the departed Sophronius. . . . Without delay I made this journey for this purpose alone ; and since then thrice have I run to Your Apostolic Feet, urging and beseeching the prayer of Sophronius and of all, that is, that You will assist the imperilled faith of Christians."

. . . . .

Honorius was dead when there appeared at the end of 638 the Ecthesis, which, though bearing the name of the Emperor Heraclius, was really the work of his Patriarch Sergius.[31]

[31] Heraclius at the end of his life wrote to Pope John IV and disowned the authorship of the Ecthesis (Mansi, x, 991).

Without doubt it relied for support and authority on the two letters of Honorius to Sergius.

This fact itself affords evidence of their recognising the leadership of the Roman see, which recognition is also implied in the contention of the unorthodox party later on in the council, that, after all, they were but giving expression to the teaching of Honorius, as Macarius of Antioch maintained.

The Ecthesis was Monothelite; it asserted "one will," but forbade the mention of "one or two operations."

A synod was held at Constantinople to approve it, and it was received as "truly agreeing with the apostolic preaching." Does this mean its agreement with Honorius?

It was, however, approved by the Easterns, in the usual Byzantine way in which they received the decisions of princes in these matters: "The holy synod following the discussions in which has been expounded the orthodox doctrine of the Most Pious and Mighty Prince, following the readings which were previously made, knowing the watchful wisdom of the exalted Prince, his perfection and his inspirations, approves, adopts, and confirms the said Exposition."[32]

Honorius had been succeeded by Severinus, but the see of Constantinople was still vacant by the death of Sergius, the next occupant of his throne (Pyrrhus) not yet being appointed.

In the meantime envoys had come from Rome to demand confirmation of the papal election, and they were presented by the clergy of Constantinople with the Ecthesis for the Pope to sign. In this, however, they refused to interest themselves.[33]

Pyrrhus, the new patriarch, held a synod in 639 and confirmed the Ecthesis anew. Pope Severinus, who had been elected soon after the death of Honorius, was not consecrated till 640, and he only lived two months and four days afterwards. But it is said he had time to hold a Roman synod which rejected Monothelitism.[34]

The next pope, John IV, gathered a synod, condemned Monothelitism, and informed Heraclius and Pyrrhus. He

[32] Mansi, x, 999.

[33] See below, on Maximus. "Having discovered the tenor of the document, since by refusing they would have caused the first and Mother of Churches, and the city, to remain so long a time in widowhood, they replied quietly: We cannot act with authority in this matter, for we have received a commission to execute, not an order to make a profession of faith. But we assure you that we will relate all that you have put forward, and we will show the document to him who is to be consecrated, and if he should judge it to be correct, we will ask him to append his signature to it." (See Art. "Maximus," J. Chapman, *Cath. Encycl.*)

[34] Hefele, v, 67, and cf. Robertson, p. 426.

next addressed a letter to the two emperors (Constantine and Heracleonas) who had succeeded their father, Heraclius. In this he undertakes to vindicate the orthodoxy of his predecessor, Honorius. His letter, in fact, constituted "the Apology for Honorius."[35]

He maintains that the real reason why both Sergius and Honorius use the expression "one will" is because they would not admit *contrary* wills.

Now came changes in Church and State. Constantine was already dead—murdered, it is said—the outcome of the schemes of his stepmother Martina, who wished the rule to be the sole care of her own son, Heracleonas. And now the latter with mutilated nose was exiled, and his mother banished too, without her tongue. The Patriarch Pyrrhus was deposed (it was said that he was mixed up in the crime against Constantine) and Paul intruded into his place, entrusted with his see.

Pope John died in 642 and was succeeded by Theodore I, a *Greek from Jerusalem*, but he refused to recognise Paul until Pyrrhus had been canonically deposed.[36] "You must therefore," he wrote, "hold an assembly of bishops in order to examine his affair, and Our archdeacon Sericus, as well as Our deputy and deacon Martin, will be Our representatives there. Pyrrhus need not himself be personally present. . . . He heaped praise upon Heraclius, who anathematised the orthodox doctrine, subscribed his sophistical edict, seduced the bishops to the same, and allowed that document to be posted up to the disparagement of the Council of Chalcedon. . . ."

Pyrrhus might find powerful support in Constantinople, says Pope Theodore, so "we have petitioned the emperor by letter, to send Pyrrhus to Rome that he may be judged here by a synod." At the beginning of the letter the pope notes how anxious, apparently, Paul is to show that he does not follow in the steps of Pyrrhus. "Why, then," he asks, "has not Your Fraternity removed that document which was posted up at public places, since it was now quashed?"

While Pyrrhus is in Africa he comes in contact with the Abbot Maximus (see below, p. 275), and with him he holds a great disputation, with the result that Pyrrhus professes himself convinced, and for the time being recants his heresy.

The disputation concludes with Pyrrhus saying:

"I will do it [anathematise the heresy] but I should like

[35] Mansi, x, 682. Hefele, v, 37 and 67.
[36] Mansi, x, 702. Hefele, v, 71.

first to visit the graves of the Apostles and the Pope, and to transmit to the latter a statement of my error."[37]

However, Pyrrhus later relapsed into his heresy.

Meanwhile Paul, the intruder into the see of Constantinople, receives at the request of the African bishops, who had held two synods in condemnation of Monothelitism, a letter from Pope Theodore I. The papal letter is not extant, though Paul's answer is. But his exposition was so unsatisfactory that Theodore pronounced him deposed, and at the same time appointed as " apostolic vicar "[38] Stephen of Dor, to depose and replace recalcitrant Monothelite bishops. Paul, greatly incensed, destroyed the altar of the Latin legation at Constantinople, and took vengeance on the apocrisiaries who came from Rome with the sentence of his deposition. All this is related by Pope Martin in his opening speech at his Lateran Council, 649.

The next step Paul took, was to persuade the emperor to withdraw the Ecthesis and in its place put forth the Typus. Paul was the real author of the Typus, as Sergius had been the author of the Ecthesis. The Typus decreed that henceforth no one should use the expressions " one will " or " two wills," " one operation " or " two operations." But this put the orthodox on the same level as the heretics; yet obviously, if the Typus was condemned, Honorius was condemned. It was an ingenious move on the part of Paul.

The preamble is worth quoting, for it shows the obsequious respect with which the sovereign was treated by the Byzantines when dealing with theological matters.

> " As We are accustomed to do everything and to have regard to everything which can serve to the welfare of Our Christian State, and especially whatever concerns the unfalsified doctrine upon which all Our happiness depends, We perceived that Our orthodox people had become greatly agitated because," etc.

And severe penalties for non-acceptance of the Typus were imposed.[39]

[37] Mansi, x, 709. Hefele, v, 89. Pyrrhus accompanied Maximus to Rome, where he condemned the Ecthesis, and made a profession of faith, was admitted to communion by the pope, and sometimes took his place in celebrating the Holy Mysteries. On his relapse he was solemnly excommunicated. cf. Robertson, p. 427.

[38] Hefele, v, 94. Pargoire, p. 154.

[39] Deposition for a bishop or cleric; excommunication and banishment from his monastery for a monk; loss of office and dignity for a civil or military official; for a civilian of the upper class, loss of property; for one

Pope Theodore died 649, apparently without having seen the Typus.[40] And now the new pope, Martin I, held his Lateran Council of 649. This famous synod, a gathering of 105 bishops of Italy and its dependencies chiefly, "in importance almost œcumenical," it is claimed,[41] was presided over by the Pope himself. It condemned Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paul, and the rest of the Monothelites, together with the Ecthesis and the Typus.

It is noteworthy and significant that Honorius is not mentioned. The only time in which the sound of his name was heard was in the reading of the letter of Paul to Pope Theodore in which Paul appeals to Honorius. In the second session the Palestinian bishop, Stephen of Dor, read his striking memorial, to which already reference has been made. Following this there was introduced a deputation of thirty-seven Greek abbots, priests and monks who had resided several years in Rome, probably driven there by the Saracen invasion. They were led by John, Abbot of S. Sabas, Jerusalem; Theodore, Abbot of the Greek Laura (of S. Sabas) in Africa; Thalassius, Abbot of the Armenian monastery of S. Renatus at Rome; George, Abbot of the Cilician monastery at Rome. They asked for the condemnation of Monothelitism and of Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paul and the rest, and of the Typus.

But once more we have a very striking instance of the acknowledgment of the papacy. The petition which these Orientals had all signed speaks of the synod as

> "assembled according to the holy command and request of him who by divine choice is the President and exarch of you all, the Bishop of bishops and Father of fathers, our Lord Martin, the thrice-blessed Pope."[42]

The Acts of the council were sent together with an encyclical letter, to all bishops, priests, deacons, abbots, ascetes and to the whole Church.

The Lateran Council was still sitting when there arrived in

of the common people, corporal punishment and permanent exile (Mansi, x, 1029).

[40] Hefele, v, 97. But Gasquet says, p. 246, *Op. cit.*, that Pope Theodore could not keep silence for silence would give consent. He therefore held a synod at the Lateran and condemned the Typus in these words: "It witnesses to good intentions, but its consequences are in disagreement with the intention of him who conceived it."

[41] cf. Hefele, p. 98, and cf. Chapman, *The Condemnation of Pope Honorius*, p. 48, "a Council in importance the rival, in authority the equal, of œcumenical synods and in interest the superior of many of them," and p. 56, where he claims that "Thus at last was an infallible decision of Rome on the subject published to the world."

[42] Mansi, x, 903.

Rome the Emperor's chamberlain, Olympius, commissioned as exarch of Italy, to obtain the subscription of the Pope to the Typus.

There is a curious tale told of the failure of the envoy to encompass the death of the Pope,[43] but the next exarch, Theodore Calliopa, was commissioned by the Emperor to cast Martin into prison. The Pope foresaw what was about to happen, and with his clergy took refuge in the Lateran Basilica. In fact, he had his bed, for he was ill, placed in front of the altar.

Calliopa, on the pretext that Martin had acquired the Apostolic See irregularly—since apparently his consecration had not awaited the imperial confirmation[44]—gave orders that he was to be taken to Constantinople and another was to be elected to take his place.

Martin made no resistance to this insolent persecution, nor would he countenance any, though the populace was aroused. Smuggled out of Rome, it was more than fifteen months, and after terrible hardships, that at length he reached Constantinople, 17th September, 654. Ninety-three days of cruel imprisonment followed, and then his first examination by the tribunal. He was accused less of heresy than of the crime of *lèse majesté*.[45] But, of course, there was nothing extraordinary about that. That has always been the method in religious persecutions.

He was subjected to almost incredible cruelties and indignities, loaded with chains, kept in the company of murderers. It is probably untrue that his tongue and hands were cut,[46] but he was at length banished to the Chersonese, where on 16th September, 655, he died. The Easterns to-day make memorial of him on 13th April, 15th September and 20th September.[47]

And to-day they sing to him:

> "By what name shall I address thee, O Martin! Shall I call thee the glorious leader of the Orthodox Faith for all? Or the sacred chief of divine dogmas speaking nought but truth? Or the most true reprover of error? . . . In the midst of the Synod thou didst condemn Pyrrhus and Sergius, and those who blasphemed with them. . . . We know that thou wast the foundation of bishops, pillar of the Orthodox Faith,

[43] Olympius sent his sword-bearer to receive communion with the plan of murdering the pope either at the administration or at the kiss of peace. But by a miracle his eyes were held and he could not see the pope.

[44] *Irregulariter et sine lege episcopatum subripuisse* (Mansi, 852).

[45] Gasquet, *Op. cit.*, p. 249.

[46] *Ibid.*, 249.

[47] See Nilles, *Kalendarium*, i, 137–138.

teacher of religion . . . . Thou didst adorn the Divine See of Peter, and since then thou on his divine Rock hast preserved the Church immovable, so now with him (Peter) art thou glorified."

The Patriarch Paul was lying stricken with mortal illness when Martin was in prison in Constantinople. To the Emperor, who came to visit him to relate all about Martin, he cried, " Woe is me ! must this also come before God for me to answer for ? " and adjured him to put a stop to his persecution of the Pope[48] which would rise up against him at the Day of Judgment. The death of Paul allowed Pyrrhus to ascend the patriarchal throne again.

The Abbot Maximus was the next to suffer. He, like Pope Martin, had been brought to Constantinople—a little previously —but his trial did not take place till 655.

This remarkable man was born *c.* 580 of a family of high rank in Constantinople, and after being secretary of the Emperor Heraclius became a monk at Chrysopolis, opposite Constantinople, *c.* 630. Moved by the ravages of the Monothelite heresy, he betook himself to Rome,[49] and it was while on his way there that his famous disputation with Pyrrhus took place.[50] Maximus had succeeded to the place of Sophronius as the great champion of orthodoxy. *He would have nothing said against the orthodoxy of Honorius.*[51]

In a letter to a friend, the Patrician Peter, an official in the East, he condemned the Ecthesis, but defended Honorius ; and incidentally this Eastern showed his idea of the status and function of the Apostolic See of Rome :

" In this regard the wretches have not conformed to the sense of the Apostolic See, and what is more laughable, or rather lamentable as proving their ignorance, they have not hesitated to lie against the Apostolic See itself . . . . in the Acts they have composed in defence of the impious Ecthesis they have claimed the great Honorius on their side."

What can be more explicit than the following passage :

" If the Roman see recognises Pyrrhus to be not only a reprobate but a heretic, it is certainly plain that every one who anathematises those who have rejected Pyrrhus, *anathematises the Roman see, that is, he anathematises*

[48] For Martin, see Robertson, ii, p. 429, *seq.*

[49] Soloviev, p. 42. Art. " Maximus," *Cath. Encycl.*, x, p. 78, by J. Chapman ; and Pargoire, *Op. cit.*, p. 191 and p. 244, *seq.*

[50] Hefele-Leclercq, iii, 401, *seq.*

[51] *Ibid.*, p. 415.

the Catholic Church. I need hardly add that he excommunicates himself also, if indeed he is in communion with the Roman see and the Catholic Church of God."

He goes on to deprecate the giving of titles of respect such as *almificus* or *sanctissimus* to Pyrrhus:

"For it is not right that one who has already been condemned and cast out by the Apostolic See of the city of Rome for his wrong opinions should be named with any kind of honour, until he be received by her, having returned to her, nay, to Our Lord, by a pious confession and orthodox faith . . . ."

And later on he writes:

"Let him hasten before all to satisfy the Roman see. That done, all will with one accord, everywhere hold him pious and orthodox. Indeed, he is talking in vain when he . . . . does not satisfy and beg forgiveness of the Blessed Pope of the most holy Roman Church, that is, of the Apostolic See. This see, from the very Incarnate Word of God, and also from all holy councils according to the sacred canons and definitions, has received universal and supreme dominion, authority, and power of binding and loosing over the holy Churches of God all over the world. For when this binds and looses, so also does the Word in Heaven, who rules the heavenly virtues."

At his examination he said:

"I have no doctrine of my own, but the common doctrine of the Catholic Church."

They asked him whether he communicated with the see of Constantinople. He replied:

"With the Church of Constantinople, however, I cannot agree, because by the Ecthesis and the Typus it has infringed on the Four Œcumenical Councils."

They told him that the envoys from Eugenius, the new pope, would communicate with the patriarch on the morrow, and indeed the deputies had shown a disposition to enter into communion with the patriarch on the basis of a compromising formula.[52]

His reply to this was:

[52] Hefele, v, 128, says: "on condition that in Christ a hypostatic union and two natural wills should be recognised, i.e. considering Him as a person, we should speak of only one will, but if we have the two natures in view, we should ascribe a proper will to each of them." Migne, *P. G.*, xc. 109, *seq.*

> " Even if the Roman envoys do so, they yet do not prejudice the Roman see, because they have brought with them no letter from the Pope to the Patriarch (but only to the Emperor)."

This they wished to interpret as an insult to the Emperor, because he spoke against the Typus ; but he countered this by saying that the Emperor was misguided and could disown the authorship of the Typus, just as Heraclius disowned the authorship of the Ecthesis.

To a Greek monk, Anastasius, who was one of his companions in his persecution, he wrote a letter, telling him of the scheming duplicity of his persecutors. The monk sent information to some Greek monks, exiles at Cagliari, and urged them to get somehow or other to Rome and ask the help of

> " the men of elder Rome, firm as a rock, who, indeed, together with you, are ever our patrons and most fervent defenders of the truth."

This was because of what Maximus had told him that his tormentors had said, " The Churches of Constantinople, Rome, Alexandria and Jerusalem are now united ; if you wish then to be a Catholic, you must unite with them." But they were quibbling by means of their compromising formula, and he refused to have anything to do with it, but remained steadfast, even though they dared to declare " The emperor and the patriarch have resolved in accordance with the papal decision (*per praeceptum papae*) to punish you with anathema and with death if you do not obey."

At a later examination Troilus again brought up the charge : " If you have spoken anathemas on the Typus, then you have done so on the emperor," to which Maximus retorted : " No, not on the emperor, but only on a document which did *not* proceed from him." And then he was asked why he loved the Latins and hated the Greeks. To which he replied : " I love the Romans, because we have the same Faith ; I love the Greeks, because we have the same language."

On the next day the " Resident Council " was held and persuaded the emperor to accept their decree and to banish Maximus to Byzia in Thrace.

On the 2nd of August, 656, Bishop Theodosius of Cæsarea was sent by the emperor to try the effect of one more discussion with Maximus. Theodosius assured Maximus that the emperor would withdraw the Typus if he would come into communion with the Church of Constantinople, but Maximus insisted on

the acceptance of the canons of Pope Martin's Lateran Council. Theodosius, with the usual acquiescence of State interference in the domain of the Church, replied that it was not valid, because held without the assent of the emperor. To this Maximus crushingly retorted: "If then it is imperial ordinances and not pious faith which give validity to councils, let them then accept the councils held against the *homoousion*, at Tyre, at Antioch, at Seleucia, and the Robber Council of Ephesus, since they took place at command of princes."[53]

Bishop Theodosius, however, was evidently much influenced by the arguments of Maximus adduced from the Fathers, and offered to draw up a written acknowledgment of the Two Natures, Wills and Energies, if Maximus would come into communion with the Church of Constantinople. The reply to this is significant of Maximus' view of Rome: that it was not his place as a mere abbot to receive such a written acknowledgment; the ecclesiastical rule required that the emperor and the patriarch with his synod, should apply with this to the Roman bishop.

In 662 Maximus with his companions, the monk Anastasius and the Roman deacon Anastasius, were brought to Constantinople, and they were anathematised and sentenced to have their tongues cut out and their right hands chopped off, and then, after being exhibited through all twelve parts of the city, to be banished to Colchis. The monk died in July, Maximus in August, while the other lived on to the next year.[54]

The Easterns to-day honour them as saints and martyrs. But the extracts from the personal writings and the history are sufficient to show that they would not have suffered death, they would not be honoured to-day by Easterns as martyrs, if they had not stood up so pertinaciously for what they considered had been and should be the historic and necessary relation of the Eastern Churches with the see of Rome.[55]

. . . . .

Pope Vitalian[56] succeeded Eugenius, 657.

He was politic, and in his synodal letter said nothing about

[53] *P. G.*, xv, 136.

[54] Robertson, p. 431, *Op. cit.* Hefele-Leclercq, iii, 461–470.

[55] See Nilles, *Kalendarium*, p. 244 for Aug. 13, the Feast of the Translation of S. Maximus' Relics. "Enkindled with Divine zeal as with a fire, he went to the Elder Rome, and persuaded the most blessed Pope Martin to assemble a local synod, and to anathematise the leaders of the impious teaching of those who prated of but one will in Christ."

[56] It was this pope who made and consecrated Theodore, a Greek of Tarsus, to be Archbishop of Canterbury (668) at Rome.

the Typus; nor of Martin and Maximus. "The fate of Pope Martin," remarks Robertson, "had disposed his successors, Eugenius and Vitalian, to peaceful courses." Vitalian's name was inscribed on the diptychs of Constantinople—the first instance of a pope's name being entered since Honorius. Constans visited Rome and was received with great honour in spite of his crimes.[57] On his way back he was murdered at Syracuse, 688, and was succeeded by his son Constantine Pogonatus.

Vitalian was succeeded by Adeodatus, 672, who in 676 was followed by Donus or Domnus. To Donus, whom he addressed as οἰκουμενικὸς πάπας, Constantine Pogonatus, desirous of bringing the East and the West into concord, wrote proposing a universal conference (καθολικὴ συνάθροισις) of both thrones. But Donus was already dead and Agatho, the new pope, reigned.

Agatho held preliminary synods at Rome[58] and the Sixth General Council itself opened at Constantinople on 7 November, 680. The Emperor Pogonatus in person presided,[59] and the representatives of the pope sat on his left.[60]

The Letter which Pope Agatho addressed to the Sixth General Council was intended evidently as a counterpart to the great *Tome* of Leo.[61] For our purpose, it is of great importance because of the claims and privileges of the see of Rome so plainly stated; since, apparently, they were accepted without contradiction and as a matter of course by the assembled Fathers. And Agatho was *a Greek* from Sicily.

He sends his legates, he says, *ut nihil profecto praesumant augere, minuere, vel mutare sed traditionem hujus Apostolicae Sedis ut a praedecessoribus apostolicis pontificibus instituta est, sinceriter enarrare.* He gives the faith of the Roman Church about the Natures and Operations, the apostolic and evangelical tradition "which the Holy Ghost taught the Prince of the Apostles," and this S. Peter handed down to the apostolic

57 Robertson, p. 433.

58 Bishops Abundantius of Paterno, John of Reggio and John of Portus, priests Theodore and John; Deacon John; Sub-deacon Constantine from Rome. The priest Theodore a deputy of the Church at Ravenna.

59 The emperor presided only to see that things were conducted "decently and in order." The papal legates sign the minutes of each session before all the bishops, but the emperor signs after the latter. And the members of the council subscribe with the formula ὁρισας ὑπέγραψα but the emperor ἀνέγνωμεν καὶ συνηνέσαμεν which shows that he did not regard himself as a member of the synod, while those who took his place when he was absent did not sign at all.

60 Which, in the East, was the place of honour.

61 Robertson, ii, p. 434, and Soloviev, xlii.

Church which *nunquam a via veritatis in qualibet erroris parte deflexa est.* He speaks of Peter as " the co-operator of your pious labour," and says of the Roman Church that " her authority has always been faithfully followed and embraced as that of the Prince of the apostles by the whole Church and all councils, and by all the venerable Fathers who embraced her doctrine, by which they have shone as most approved lamps of the Church of Christ."[62] Her teaching, he says, is " the living tradition of the apostles of Christ. . . . This is the rule of the true faith," he tells the emperor, " which in prosperity and adversity, this spiritual Mother of your most serene empire, the apostolic Church of Christ has ever held and defends. . . . She remains unspotted to the end, according to the Divine promise of Our Lord and Saviour Himself. . . . Consequently . . . . the whole number of prelates and priests and clergy and people, in order to please God and save their souls, must confess with us the formula of truth and apostolic tradition, the evangelical and apostolic rule of faith, which is founded upon the firm rock of Blessed Peter, the Prince of the apostles, which by his favour remains free from all error."

From this it is plain that in this Greek pope's mind, rightly or wrongly :

(1) No such thing as a possibility of disagreement with what he says is contemplated.
(2) Rome has always taught the same.
(3) The Roman Church cannot err.

And as no protest is made, it must be taken that silence on the part of the Council gives consent.

To the emperor another letter was sent by Agatho's Roman Council (signed, among others, by our own Wilfrid of York), which contains the following : " the light of our Catholic and apostolic true Faith . . . . which . . . . by the blessed ministry of Peter and Paul, the Princes of the apostles, by their disciples and apostolic successors has, by the help of God, been preserved, step by step down to our littleness, obscured by no foul darkness of heretical error." And, after an exposition of their faith, they continue : " This we believe. This we have received of the apostolic tradition, whose authority in all we follow. So the council under Pope Martin taught."

The Roman Council speaks of " the see of Blessed Peter . . . . whose authority all Christian nations revere out of reverence for S. Peter himself," and they urge him to imitate his predecessor Marcian, " who embraced the Tome of the holy Pope

[62] Mansi, xi, 239.

Leo, which by his words, Peter the apostle had published," and they express the hope that the result may be that all are " more perfectly united in the unity of the true and apostolic confession which the holy Roman Church now preserves with us."[63] So that the emperor was fully aware of the position Rome assigned herself. He does not disagree. He does not say it is novel and unheard-of.

The unorthodox opposition in the council was represented by Macarius of Antioch, who was a Monothelite, and in the synod undertook to substantiate his teaching. He maintained that he used no new expression but such as he had received from (among others) " Honorius, who was Pope of Old Rome," and he brought forward a quantity of Patristic quotations, which, he claimed, supported him and Monothelitism. It was at the end of the second Session that George, the new Patriarch of Constantinople, proposed that the letter from Agatho and his council, which we have already considered, should be read ; and this was done at the Fourth Session, 15th November.

At the Eighth Session the Patriarchs George and Macarius, having had an opportunity of comparing the Roman letters with the Patristic passages, gave their conclusions. George declared he was convinced the writings were fully in agreement and confessed himself a firm Diothelite, and asked permission of the emperor to restore the name of Pope Vitalian to the diptychs—it had been removed at the instance of Macarius of Antioch. This was of course assented to by the synod. Macarius then was asked (" since the most holy Macarius does not consent to the tenor of the orthodox letters sent by Agatho the most holy Pope of Rome ") what conclusion he had come to. And, in reply, he read a long confession of his beliefs.[64]

He makes no compromise. He is quite frankly Monothelite. He makes a strong attack on Maximus, whom he accuses of reproducing the heresy of Theodore of Mopsuestia and of Manichæism ; and once more appeals to the " blessed Fathers " *Honorius*, Sergius and Cyrus.

What, after this, could the council do but add the name of Honorius to the list of those condemned ? Macarius is deposed. And thrice he had appealed to Honorius.

. . . . .

The condemnation of Honorius has already been discussed. Here it remains but to show the testimony the *Council* gave to the position of Rome. This is shown by three documents :

[63] Mansi, xi, 285, *seq.*
[64] Mansi, xi, 350. Hefele, v, 158.

(1) *The Decree of the Council:*

"This holy and Œcumenical Council has received and with uplifted hands has greeted the letter of the most holy and blessed Pope of elder Rome, Agatho to the Emperor."[64a]

(2) *The* λόγος προσφωνητικός addressed to the Emperor by the Council.

It calls the Pope Ἀρχιερατικώτατος πρόεδρος of the apostolic acropolis, and proclaims how each of the Five General Councils has been convened by Pope and Emperor (see p. 354).

It contains these passages:

"In accordance with the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, and in agreement with one another, and assenting to the Letter of our most blessed Father and most high Pope Agatho addressed to Your Majesty, and also to that of his holy synod of 125 bishops."

Again:

"Lest any one should reprehend the divine zeal of the all-holy Pope or the present angelic assemblage, we have followed his teaching, and he the Apostolic and Patristic tradition."

It is *to the Emperor*, it should be remembered, that the Council speaks thus of the Pope:

"With us fought the Prince of the apostles (ὁ κορυφαιότατος πρωταπόστολος) for his imitator and successor is our protector, and he declared unto us in his letter the secret of theology. . . . *And the ink shone, and by Agatho Peter spoke.*"[65]

(3) *The letter of this Œcumenical Council to the Pope.*

"The greatest diseases require the greatest remedies . . . . and therefore Christ our true God has given us Your Holiness as a wise physician, who firmly repellest the contagious plague of heresy by the antidotes of orthodoxy and bestowest health on the members of the Church. And therefore we willingly leave what should be done to you, as occupying *the first See of the Universal Church and standing on the firm Rock of the Faith*, having read through the writings of the true confession sent by Your Paternal Holiness to our most religious Emperor; which *we recognise as divinely written from*

[64a] Mansi xi, 632.

[65] Mansi, xi, 658. Hefele, v, 177. See Soloviev, p. 94.

the chiefest Head of the apostles, and by which we have put to flight the dangerous opinions of the heresy which lately arose."[66]

Roman claims and Roman " prerogatives " could hardly be set forth and acknowledged more explicitly than in this letter of an Œcumenical Council. It addresses a pope as the physician necessary for the present sickness of the Church. It declares that it is in accordance with the judgment previously given by the pope that it has acted.

But the letters of the Emperor are evidence, too, of his belief in the supreme position of the Roman see.

(1) *His Edict, confirming the decrees of the council :*

" These are the teachings of the voices of the Gospels and apostles, these are the doctrines of the holy councils and of the elect and Patristic tongues ; these have been *preserved untainted by Peter the Rock of the Faith, the Head of the apostles.*"[67]

(2) *The Emperor's Letter to the Pope Leo II :*

Pope Agatho died 682, not long after the council ended. This letter is addressed by the emperor to his successor Leo. Having recounted the history of the calling of the council, he speaks of the letter of Pope Agatho, how they compared it with the Gospels, apostolic scriptures, definitions of œcumenical councils, Patristic writings, and found, he says, " nothing out of harmony ; we perceived in it the word of the true confession unaltered, and with the eyes of our understanding we saw it as it were the very ruler of the apostolic choir the πρωτοκάθεδρος Peter himself, declaring the mystery of the whole dispensation, and addressing Christ by this letter : ' Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.' . . . . *We all received it willingly and sincerely and embraced it, as though it were Peter himself with the arms of our soul.*"

The *Emperor* thus speaks of the condemned Macarius: " he leapt out of the sacerdotal circle, for he refused altogether to agree to the all-holy writings of Agatho, as though he were even raging against the coryphæus Peter himself . . . . for the law goeth forth from Sion the teaching of the apostolic height."

[66] Mansi, xi, 683. The council had acted according to the sentence previously pronounced by the pope (Hefele-Leclercq, iii, 512). κατὰ τὴν τοῖς ἱεροῖς ὑμῶν γράμμασιν ἐπ' αὐτοῖς προψηφισθεῖσαν ἀπόφασιν.

[67] Mansi, xi, 698.

Of the members of the council he says that :

" all of one accord begged Our Serenity to send them (Macarius and his fellows) to Your Blessedness."

The *Emperor* gives glory to God :

" Who has kept the faith among you unharmed. For how should he not do so in that rock on which He founded His Church and prophesied that the gates of Hell, all the ambushes of the heretics should not prevail against it ? From it, as from the vault of heaven, the word of the true confession flashed forth and enlightened the souls of the lovers of Christ, and brought warmth to frozen orthodoxy."

All, he says, have been united in one Fold—

" by the One Good Shepherd, by *Whom You have been appointed in pasturing them.*"

(2) *To the Roman Council, the Emperor wrote :*

" You yourselves were present with τῷ οἰκουμενικῷ ἀρχιποιμένι, speaking with him in spirit and in writing. . . . . *We admired the writing of Agatho as the voice of divine Peter*, for nobody disagreed except one."

One would naturally not be surprised to see Roman claims and privileges mentioned in Leo's dogmatic letter to the Emperor Constantine Pogonatus, confirming the Council (682). But the above are the *letters of the Emperor and of the Council to the Pope. And they give the testimony of yet another sovereign and yet another Œcumenical Council to papal prerogatives.*

There was however a growing feeling of hostility to the West on the part of a certain section of the Easterns, and this was soon to be plainly manifested.

No disciplinary canons had been issued by the Fifth General Council (553) or by the Sixth General Council (680).

In 692 Justinian II convoked a council to supply them. It met under the cupola (*Trullum*, τρούλλος) of the royal palace, as the last one had. But the designation *in Trullo* always applies to this one. Sometimes also it is called Quini-Sext (πενθέκτη) because it completes the Fifth and Sixth Councils.

It was attended by 211 bishops, and they were all Easterns. It was not an Œcumenical Council, though the Easterns wished to regard it so. In fact the members in their address to the Emperor describe it as " this holy and God-chosen Œcumenical Synod." To-day they still so regard it. They say it is a continuation of the Sixth, so that the disciplinary canons of *in Trullo* are looked upon as canons of the Sixth Council. This the Westerns have never allowed.

It may be that having seen in the case of Honorius some sort of victory in the dogmatic field over the see of Peter, the disaffected Easterns (and there was, as said just now, more and more manifesting itself a considerable amount of ill-feeling against Rome) looked for a similar victory in the sphere of discipline.[68]

There were 102 canons put forth by this council. The " apostolic canons " received by this assembly number eighty-five. One sees in this the animus against the West, which received only fifty.

But the hostility is apparent still more in Canon 30, which speaks of the " strange manners " of " the barbarians." And by this the Westerns are meant. But especially in Canon 36, which deals with the vexed question of the precedence of Constantinople, does this jealousy show itself. Canon 36 thus runs :

> " Renewing the decrees of the Second and Fourth œcumenical Synods, we decide that the see of Constantinople shall enjoy the same rights (τῶν ἴσων ἀπολύειν πρεσβείων) as that of Old Rome, shall be highly regarded in ecclesiastical matters as that is, and shall be second after it. After Constantinople comes the see of Alexandria, then Antioch, and next that of Jerusalem."[69]

In Canon 51, dealing with the prohibition of animal contests and theatrical shows, the claim is made that *in Trullo* is an Œcumenical Council. It begins : " This Holy and Œcumenical Synod," showing the weight that was being asserted for these disciplinary canons by the Easterns there.[70]

Again, in Canon 55 : " In Rome they fast every Saturday in Lent. This is contrary to the 66th Apostolical Canon, and may no longer be done. If any one does so, he will, if cleric, be deposed ; if layman, excommunicated."

As for the fasting, which the Easterns so vigorously deal with in Canon 55, this is to be said. The fasting on Saturday was a purely local custom, and, as with their laws about celibacy, the

[68] cf. Pargoire, *Op. cit.*, 199, and cf. Robertson, *Hist. Chr. Ch.*, ii, 440 : " it would seem, indeed, as if the Eastern bishops were bent, as at Chalcedon, on moderating the triumph of Rome in the late doctrinal question by legislating on other matters in a manner which would be unpalatable to the pope ; and the reception of these canons by the East only, where they were quoted as the work of the sixth General Council, was the first manifest step toward the separation of the Greek and Latin Churches."
cf. Soloviev, xxxvi.

[69] cf. Hefele, ii, 357 ; iii, 411.

[70] cf. Soloviev, *Op. cit.*, p. xliii.

Westerns had no desire to force their customs on the East. Here, on the contrary, one sees an intolerant, overbearing spirit not content with following its own customs, trying to force its peculiarities on the West.

The anti-Western feeling is also manifested in Canons 67, 82 and 72, the last declaring marriage with a heretic invalid, where Rome accounts it unlawful.

It is amazing that, having passed these canons, the Easterns should then proceed to send them to the pope for his confirmation. These Easterns are fully aware of the necessity of getting their decisions sanctioned by the Apostolic See. The opposition of the pope is shown, however, to be sufficient to prevent a council called by the emperor being reckoned œcumenical. The signature of Sergius was sought in vain, and John VII sent the copy they despatched to him back again unsigned. And the place for the signature of the pope is a blank still.[71]

The Easterns, after Balsamon, assert that the pope was represented at the council *in Trullo* by his legates—Basil of Gortyna in Crete, who belonged, as of Illyricum, to the Roman patriarchate, and the metropolitan of Ravenna. Basil seems to have called himself papal legate, but there is no evidence of his commission, apart from the statement of the *Liber Pontificalis* that their signatures were obtained by fraud, their good faith being imposed upon.

The popes anathematised the council of Justinian, reserving to themselves the right of approving some of the canons which were promulgated there. But those concerning fasting and celibacy they would tolerate at no cost.

This council cannot therefore be reckoned œcumenical on any grounds. How can it be—judged even by the test of "universal consent"—when the pope and the West rejected it? Whatever conditions are stipulated as necessary to obtain for a council the right to be accounted "œcumenical" this council *in Trullo* satisfies none.

Simeon Metaphrastes[72] and Gregory of Cæsarea protest against the Council *in Trullo* being designated "œcumenical," but their grounds are uncertain—that no priest of Rome represented the pope there and that the consent of the Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem was wanting, for, as we have observed, Basil of Gortyna in Crete, legitimately or not, claimed when signing his name to be the representative of the

[71] Robertson, ii, 439, "immediately after the imperial signature, a space was left for that of Sergius, Bishop of Rome"; and p. 441, *ibid.*

[72] *Vit. Steph. Jun. c.* 30.

Church of Rome, and Anastasius, while stating that the Bishop of Constantinople was the only patriarch there, yet in another place says that the decrees were signed by the Patriarchs of Alexandria, Jerusalem and Antioch, *qui eo tempore illic convenerant.*[73]

If the Council *in Trullo* be accounted œcumenical, then there is once again the claim made by the pope of being able to invalidate the decrees of an Œcumenical Council.[74]

. . . . .

The Emperor Philippicus, 711, during his short reign of two years, revived Monothelitism and condemned the Sixth General Council. He had been much influenced by the Monothelite monk John, who had prophesied the empire for him and a long and glorious reign if he would reject the Sixth Council.[75] The Patriarch Cyrus was dethroned, exiled, and eventually strangled, and John took his place.

But the emperor's successor, Anastasius, was orthodox. John felt himself in an embarrassing position. He now wanted to restore the Sixth General Council, and with this object he wrote to Pope Constantine to make his excuses ; that he had been manipulated by Philippicus, that he had thought it the part of prudence to yield, that he had accepted the patriarchal throne unwillingly, and then only to keep heretics out. And so on.

But this is how he thought fit to address the Pope Constantine :

> " You are the disciple and successor of him who heard from the mouth of the Master ' Simon, Satan has demanded to sift you as wheat, but I have prayed that your faith fail not, and when thou shalt be converted, strengthen thy brethren.' You ought therefore to undertake what concerns correction, but more willingly still that which concerns pity ; for the Lord compels the Chief of the apostles to recognise by his own personal experience what is the weakness of the flesh, so that he may understand that those who have fallen may yet be restored."

73 See Hefele, v, p. 237.

74 cf. Gasquet, *Op. cit.*, p. 147. *En somme, il s'agit ici, non de la question de droit, qui est hors de conteste, mais de la question de fait. Il est acquis pour tous que le refus d'approbation du pape suffit à infirmer la validité des canons édictés dans une assemblée œcuménique.*

75 *P. G.*, cvii, 772. See Robertson, ii, p. 444 for Philippicus' efforts to abrogate the sixth General Council, and for Pope Constantine's opposition. For the visit of Constantine to Constantinople at the command of the Emperor Justinian II, probably regarding the canons of Quinisext, see *ibid.*, p. 442 and H. K. Mann, Art. " Pope Constantine," *Cath. Encycl.*

And, as a postscript, he adds :

" O You who have been strengthened in the Lord, pray for me, Most Holy and Blessed Father."[76]

The answer of the pope is not extant. But evidently communion between the West and the East was restored.

[76] Mansi, xii, 206.

CHAPTER XIV

THE ICONOCLASTIC CONTROVERSY AND THE SEVENTH GENERAL COUNCIL (786)

THE last of the Seven General Councils is concerned with the settling of the fierce disputes regarding the use and cultus of sacred images—the Iconoclastic controversy.

The East had long cherished a particular and peculiar devotion to holy images and pictures. The Emperor Heraclius, for example, had made a point of having the representation of the Virgin of Edessa borne in reverent pomp whenever he went on his various enterprises and expeditions.

People took oaths upon the sacred images, and they even went so far as to appoint them godparents.[1] But this was not the limit of the cultus, and it seems not unlikely that in many cases the devotion had degenerated into superstition.[2]

[1] Even S. Theodore of Studium approved of this custom. Hefele-Leclercq (*t.* iii, p. 613) quotes a letter of congratulation addressed by Theodore to a court official on having given to his son as godparent the icon of S. Demetrius (*P. G.*, xcix, 962).

The whole of Leclercq's valuable note p. 610, *seq.*, should be studied. Excesses and abuses are incontestable.

[2] Leclercq quotes the letters of Michael II to Louis le Débonnaire (Mansi, xiv, 417-422) and comments: "*Sans doute, ce témoignage d'un prince iconoclaste ne doit pas être accepté sans contrôle, cependant les faits qu'il avance peuvent être tenus pour exacts, semble-t-il.*" The letter says: "They have removed from the churches the holy Cross and have replaced it by images before which they burn incense, so that they render them an honour like to that which is rendered to the sacred sign on which Christ suffered. They chant psalms before these images, prostrate themselves before them and implore their help. Many dress them with linen vestments, and choose them to serve as godparents for their children. Others, wishing to take the monastic habit, abandon the old tradition according to which when the hair is cut off it is received by persons of mark, and make it fall into the hands of holy images. Some priests and clerics have the custom of scraping the paint off the images and mix this dust with the Bread and the Wine and distribute the mixture to the Faithful after the Mass. Others place the Body of the Saviour in the hands of the images whence those who communicate come to receive It. Others, again, despising our churches, celebrate the Divine Service in private houses, using an image as an altar. These abuses and many more like them go contrary to our religion and are unworthy of it in the judgment of wise men."

And now came revulsion, opposition, reaction. For it was remembered that the Church had not always favoured religious art. She had, in fact, in her wisdom at first somewhat discouraged it.[3] And for very good reasons—the Jews, so opposed to idolatry, might imagine (wrongly, of course) that the Christians were but another kind of heathen, and so be frightened away from entering the Church. Early Christian writers undoubtedly recorded abuses.[4]

The Council of Elvira at the beginning of the fourth century had gone so far as to enact *"ne quod colitur et adoratur in parietibus depingatur"* (Mansi xii, 264) though, on the other hand, Gregory the Great had had to expostulate with a Gallic bishop, Serenus of Marseilles, who had made an end of all the sacred images in his see-city (599).[5]

There seems therefore to have been all along a tradition unsympathetic to developed religious art, side by side with a growing cultus of images. But now there burst forth a storm—there arose an orgy of destruction.

. . . . .

From 726 to 824 the Eastern Church was violently agitated by the question of the Images. Leo the Isaurian and Constantine V in the eighth century; Leo the Armenian, Michael

[3] This should be modified somewhat. As Dr. Fortescue says in his article, "Images," in the *Cath. Encycl.*, instancing the *Catacombs*: "That the first Christians had any sort of prejudice against images, pictures, or statues is a myth (defended amongst others by Erasmus) that has been abundantly dispelled by all students of Christian archæology. The idea that they must have feared the danger of idolatry among their new converts is disproved in the simplest way, by the pictures, even statues, that remain from the first centuries."

". . . . In the catacombs . . . . there are few statues, for a very simple reason. Statues are much more difficult to make and cost much more than wall paintings. But there was no principle against them. . . . The idea that the Church of the first centuries was in any way prejudiced against pictures and statues is the most impossible fiction . . . ."

". . . . Images in the East were generally flat—paintings, mosaics, basreliefs. The most zealous Eastern defenders of the holy icons seem to have felt that, however justifiable such flat representations may be, there is something about a solid statue that makes it suspiciously like an idol." cf. Pargoire, *Op. cit.*, p. 87.

[4] cf. Eusebius, *H. E.*, vii, 18. *Augustine de moribus Eccles. Cath.*, i, 34, 75. R. Janin, *Les Eglises Orientales*, p. 27.

[5] Ep. 9, Bk. IX. "You ought not to have broken what was put up in the churches, not for adoration, but merely for the promotion of reverence. It is one thing to worship an image, and another to learn from the history represented in the image what we ought to worship. For that which the Scripture is for those who can read, that a picture is for those who are incapable of reading; for in this also the uneducated see in what way they have to walk. In it they read who are not acquainted with the Scriptures."

"The use of images obtained more in the East than in the West."—Robertson, ii, *Op. cit.*, p. 359.

the Stammerer, and Theophilus in the ninth are the Iconoclastic emperors. But the last three had in an eminent degree the unwavering opposition of the monks, always the stoutest defenders of the images.

It is an interesting question—what exactly lay behind all this policy of the emperors. Iconoclasm, without a doubt, was the prevailing sentiment of the army. Those who, to attain their ambition of becoming emperor, were necessarily dependent on the soldiers for the realisation of their dreams, were not likely to do anything against the cherished beliefs of their supporters. Leo the Isaurian, Leo the Armenian and Michael the Stammerer, by being sympathetic with Iconoclasm, could take advantage of revolutions.

For the soldiers, it must be remembered, were recruited for the most part among the Easterns, and the majority of them were Armenians, Iconoclasts by conviction. They belonged often to heretical sects: Montanists and Manichæans, or were followers of the curious Paulician heresy.[6] These sects swarmed in Asia Minor. The orthodox were to them members of a foreign religion—"idolators," against whom every violence was justified.

"*En Asie surtout,*" writes Professor Diehl, "*les tendances hostiles aux images étaient puissantes; Léon III asiatique d'origine, les partageait. Ni lui, ni son fils n'ont été, comme on le croit parfois, des libres penseurs, des rationalistes, des précurseurs de la Réforme ou de la Révolution: c'étaient des hommes de leur temps, pieux, croyants, théologiens même, soucieux sincèrement de réformer la religion en la purifiant de ce qui leur semblait une idolatrie.*"[7]

But were these emperors chiefly concerned with reforming and purifying religion? It is difficult to know exactly what were the motives and objects of the policy of the Iconoclastic emperors, since all the writings defending them were done away with, while the accounts of their opponents are likely to be, to some extent, coloured by their hatred and prejudice.

Granted that the cultus of the icons had degenerated in some quarters into superstition, we are faced with the fact that in the ranks of the defenders of the images were found undoubtedly the best and the noblest men.

One explanation of the imperial policy was that Iconoclasm was a concession to Mussulman or Jewish prejudice. And it is not altogether ruled out. The Caliph Jezid II had recently

[6] See Pargoire, p. 180–1; *ibid.*, p. 253, *seq.* p. 281.
[7] *Histoire de l'Empire Byzantine*, p. 71.

inaugurated a campaign against the images among the Christians in his dominions. There is some weight in the assertion of contemporaries, therefore, that Leo was influenced by the example of the Mohammedan.[8] Professor Diehl holds, on the contrary, that Leo was not likely to consider the Mussulmans whom he had just conquered. But others think that this is not quite so certain. It is not altogether unlikely that he may have been impressed by their bravery and have attributed it in some degree to their hatred of images, the cultus of which he himself looked upon as enervating.[9]

Leo the Isaurian was a man of no education, and he seems to have been to some degree sincere in his opposition to the cultus of icons. But he was a masterful man, and determined on reaching his ends. The high-handed way is seen in his compelling Jews and Montanists to receive baptism—the latter preferring to put themselves to death by firing their house of assembly rather than submit. Some writers have suggested that the emperor, bent on the unification of the empire, had as object in the destruction of the images to make it easier for Jews and Mohammedans to embrace Christianity.[10]

The historian whom we have quoted above—one of the latest to write on the subject, but little sympathetic with the icon-worshippers—maintains that the cultus "had come to occupy a surprisingly large place in the minds of the Byzantine people," and that it was a reversion to Paganism on the part of the populace only superficially converted. He goes so far as to characterise it as "idolatry," and sees in Leo III and "a section of the superior clergy of the orthodox party" a band of people nobly and sincerely bent on moral reform and restoration of the primitive purity of religion.

But even with his bias, he sees that the most probable explanation of the movement was hatred, fear and jealousy of the monks. Leo apparently considered that the numerous monasteries and their increasing wealth constituted a grave menace to the State.[11] Their inmates were so numerous or even multitudinous, that man-power for the State was diminished. Agriculture, the army, civil administration severely suffered in personnel. It was felt, too, that the influence which

[8] See Maycock, *Op. cit.*, p. 35, "There is a significant similarity between the Mohammedan ban on images and religious symbolism on the one hand, and the Iconoclast position taken up by Leo the Isaurian on the other."

[9] *Camb. Med. Hist.*, vol. iv, chap. i, p. 6.

[10] cf. Hefele, v. 260.

[11] See Diehl, *Byzance, Grandeur et Décadence*, p. 181–3.

the monks wielded over souls made them a formidable power to counter. And in the images and in their cult, the monks had an instrument of opposition (so the emperors considered) of the greatest potentiality.[12]

All this may be true enough, but I think the real reason why the emperors directed their energies specially against the monks, and why the Roman see supported the monks, was because the monks were the most uncompromising opponents of the interference of the civil authority in the ecclesiastical sphere. They saw that this controversy on the Images in particular revealed the emperors as statesmen bent on subordination of the spiritual to the civil power.

"Their fundamental doctrine," a historian of Byzantine life has lately written, "was complete liberty, as against the State in matters of dogma no less than of discipline. But the one effective guarantee of this liberty for them was the union of the Greek Church with Rome. They recognised in the successor to S. Peter the spiritual authority denied to the emperor."[13]

And so the monks, the Studites in particular, resisted the emperor, and defended the images, even to martyrdom. The opposition of the orthodox would, however, not be owing solely to this. Questions of theology were involved. The Iconoclastic hatred of images was the expression of Manichæan belief in the essential evil of matter.[14] It is not difficult to see also that the cultus of images would not be very congruous with Monophysitism; though indeed Constantine Pogonatus' synod (754) forbade images on the ground that they encouraged both Monophysitism and Nestorianism,[15] and to-day the Nestorians have a particular repugnance against holy pictures in their Churches.[16]

[12] See *Cambridge Mediæval History*, p. 753, Art. "Byzantine Civilization," by C. Diehl.

[13] *Cambridge Mediæval History*, vol. iv, p. 247. cf. N. H. Baynes, *The Byzantine Empire*, p. 89, *seq.* The following passage from Soloviev is of interest here: "*Le siège apostolique de Rome—cette icône miraculeuse du christianisme universel—était directement engagé dans la lutte iconoclaste, puisque toutes les hérésies aboutissaient à renier la réalité de l'Incarnation divine dont la perpetuité dans l'ordre social et politique était représentée à Rome. Et l'histoire nous montre en effet que toutes les hérésies activement soutenues ou passivement acceptées par la majorité du clergé grec rencontraient un obstacle infranchissable dans l'Eglise romaine et venaient se briser contre ce roc évangélique. C'était surtout le cas pour l'hérésie iconoclaste qui, en reniant toute forme extérieure du divin dans le monde, s'attaquait directement à la chaire de Pierre dans sa raison d'être comme centre objectif et réel de l'Eglise visible*" (Soloviev, *Op. cit.*, xxix).

[14] See Soloviev, *Op. cit.* p. xxviii.

[15] See Hefele, v. 311.

[16] See Ainsworth, *Travels and Researches in Asia Minor*, ii, 249. But

The emperors, it should be repeated, were not without great and sympathetic support. They had with them the " dignified clergy," largely recruited from among laymen, ex-governors or high officials, " steeped in the doctrines of Cæsaro-papism,"[17] who in Byzantium would easily change from side to side as suited their purpose. The same ecclesiastics, now enthusiastic Iconoclasts, will at the nod of an emperor or empress become equally enthusiastic iconodules, just as their successors will similarly revel in the Feast of Orthodoxy. The emperors, too, had with them the army (composed for the most part of Asiatics) and the official world. But they had not a majority of the people on their side.

But whether the emperors were Protestants before their time (which is a favourite thesis with some), precursors of the Reformation[18] or of the Revolution ten centuries later, or Rationalists—whether or no the Iconoclastic emperors merit all the encomiums bestowed upon them for their administrative qualities[19]—the question of their motives still exercises minds to-day. But there can be no question that it was the monks who specially experienced the force of their policy.[20]

In 726 a dangerous earthquake occurred near Thera. The emperor was convinced that it was a sign of the divine displeasure against images. The first edict of Leo III was, it is said, not to destroy the images, but to hang them higher to prevent veneration. But they were already generally out of reach. He removed the famous eikon Χριστὸς ἀντιφωνητής[21] from the wall of his palace, and this act stirred up great disaffection among the populace.

Pope Gregory sent a letter to the emperor, protesting against his interference in the sphere of faith.[22] A general rising took

this is not borne out by Fortescue, see his Article, " Images," *Cath. Encycl.*, vol. vii, p. 669, and reference to Nestorian icons.

[17] *Cambridge Mediæval History*, iv, p. 246.

For the veneration of the effigies of the emperors see Batiffol and Bréhier, *Op. cit.*, p. 64.

Pargoire, *Op. cit.*, p. 4.

[18] Bréhier, *La Querelle des Images. Paparrigopoulo*, pp. 12 and 38. *Hist. de la Civilisat. hellénique*, p. 182, *seq.*

[19] cf. N. H. Baynes, *Op. cit.*, p. 52, "In fine the Iconoclasts gave to the empire a new civil and military organisation. They sought to adapt Roman law to the needs of their own day by the recognition of popular use and wont, while they strove to check superstition and to free the civil power from the dictations of devout but narrow-minded monks."

[20] See Dvorník, *Op. cit.*, p. 123.

[21] According to the legend it was a miracle-working image and once gave *bail* for a devout sailor.

[22] For Gregory II's protest and Leo's reply, see Fortescue, Art., " Iconoclasm," *Cath. Encycl.*, vol. vii, p. 621. Jaffé Reg. n. 2180.

place in Italy against Leo, which, but for the pope's intervention, would have carried things to extremes against Constantinople by breaking off allegiance. Diehl says that Gregory II, like the prudent politician that he was, saw the danger which was likely to arise if the Lombards intervened in Italian affairs, and declined to avail himself of their services. The Emperor Leo threatened the death of the pope, and deposed the Patriarch of Constantinople, Germanus, who later was strangled. The pope, however, refused to acknowledge the new patriarch, Anastasius.

Pope Gregory III, by birth *a Syrian*, the successor of Gregory II, maintained the same attitude, but he went further and did not scruple to use the Lombards. In a synod at Rome (731) of eighty-three bishops (including the Bishops of Ravenna and Grado, who though under the Byzantine emperor yet held fast to the veneration of images) he decreed that those who would not venerate the images were excommunicate. Leo "now saw in Gregory only a rebel" (Diehl, *Op. cit.*, p. 10), and retorted by confiscating papal territory in Calabria, Sicily, Crete and Illyricum, and by placing it under the authority of the Patriarch of Constantinople. He imposed fresh taxes on the Italian people. The pope in 732 excommunicated the emperor, and in 738 appealed to Charles Martel.

S. John Damascene in Syria, in safety in the Khalifa's domain—who, with Theodore of the Studium, is the most famous champion on behalf of the images—answered Leo's first edict by writing his book *Against the Destroyers of Holy Images*. The three treatises produced between 726 and 737 manifest the opposition outside the empire to the imperial policy. S. John Damascene exposes in them the dogmatic principles which underlie the cultus of the icons, and, like Theodore, this last of the Greek Fathers, this "Aquinas of the East," this compendium-maker of the tradition of all the Greek Fathers, boldly declares that it is utterly outside the province of emperors to legislate in Church affairs.[23] He thus states the view of the monks. "We are obedient to the emperor in things concerning our daily life—in tribute, taxes and payments which are his due, but in ecclesiastical government we have our pastors, preachers of the Word and exponents of ecclesiastical law. Political prosperity is the business of the emperor, the ecclesiastical organisation belongs to pastors and teachers, and

[23] On S. John Damascene and the papacy see *Echos d'Orient*, October 1924, Art. by M. Jugie, "Doctrine de Saint Jean Damascène sur l'Eglise," and Dvorník, Op. cit., p. 109.

to take it out of their hands is to commit an act of robbery."[24] "I do not recognise in imperial decrees the right of ruling the Church. The Church has her law in the tradition of the Fathers written and unwritten."[25]

. . . . .

Under Constantine V (740–775), Copronymus, the controversy became embittered, for he showed himself hostile not only to the images, but to the cultus of the Virgin-Mother, and to the intercession of the saints, for he threatened with punishment those who practised them.

Copronymus doubtless had great gifts of skill and bravery, but, in spite of efforts to whitewash him, he remains a contemptible degenerate, malignant and cruel. He is one of the "theologian" emperors. He even composed sermons and ordered them to be read in the churches. But the patriarch felt bound to refute one of his theological productions.

In 753 he gathered 338 bishops together for a council in his palace of Hieria. There was no representative of the pope or of the three Patriarchs of Antioch, Alexandria and Jerusalem. The Patriarch Anastasius was dead, and the emperor nominated at the council the monk Constantine to succeed him.

The bishops at Hieria, however, had enough self-respect and consistency left to prevent them supporting him in his condemnation of the veneration of saints, and in his desire to put an end to the honouring of the Virgin as θεοτόκος. They were, nevertheless, persuaded to declare the cultus of icons a thing "hateful and abominable" and to anathematise the Patriarch Germanus, John of Damascus, and George of Cyprus.

There was one very serious consequence of this council, as Diehl emphasises.[26] Hitherto those who venerated the icons contravened an imperial ordinance. Now they could be held to be rebels against the authority of the Church. "By entrusting to the imperial power the task of carrying the canons into effect the bishops were putting a terrible weapon into Constantine's hands, and one specially fitted to strike at the priests and monks. Any spiritual person refusing to support

[24] cf. *P. G.*, xciv, 1296–1297. *Orat.* ii, *Imag.*

[25] *P. G.*, xciv, 1281, *Orat.* i. cf. S. John Chrysostom. *P. G.*, lxi, 508. *Hom.* xv, *Ep.* ii, ad. Cor. "Ecclesiastical government is as far above the civil as the heaven is above the earth, nay, much farther above it . . . . as different from it as the soul from the body."

See also Diehl, *Byzance, Grandeur et Décadence*, p. 184, regarding Byzantine acquiescence in imperial interference in the things of the Church.

[26] *Cambridge Mediæval History, Op. cit.*, p. 13, iv.

the dogma promulgated by the council might in fact be condemned with pitiless rigour."

From 765 to 771 the persecution raged. His treatment of the monks was ingenious and diabolical in its cruelty. The emperor even sank so low as to compel the monks to parade in the Hippodrome, each with a woman on his arm. Martyrs were many. The notable defender of the images, Stephen, was captured, tortured and beheaded.[27]

One of the emperor's creatures, Michael Laconodrago, strategos of the Thracesian theme, won high praise from his master. " I have found a man after my own heart," he writes, " and you have accomplished my will."[28] Michael had gathered together all the monks and nuns of his province and offered them the choice of marriage or torture !

Pope Stephen in 769 held in Rome a council which condemned the transactions of Hieria, while three patriarchs in the East (767) declared themselves in favour of the icons.

If we may believe Theophanes,[29] Copronymus died while his chaplains at his orders invoked the aid of the All-holy Virgin, whose worship he had all his life tried to uproot.

He was succeeded by his son, Leo IV (775), who reigned only five years, and had little will or inclination to maintain to much extent the policy of his father. But his wife, the celebrated Irene, born at Athens, was a convinced supporter of image-worship, both by upbringing and conviction, and by policy. She became regent on the death of her husband, for her son, Constantine Porphyrogenitus, a boy of ten, and, determined to restore the cultus of the icons, with this end sought to renew relations with Rome. It is probable that she also hoped that her policy might regain the lost territory in Italy.

Paul, the Patriarch of Constantinople, had resigned. She filled his place with the imperial secretary, Tarasius, a layman; and he, too, was as enthusiastic as she on ending the schism which separated them from Rome.

With this object an Œcumenical Council was proposed, and Irene having obtained the approval of Pope Hadrian, summoned a council for 786.

The delegates met at Constantinople in the Church of the Holy Apostles. Plato, abbot of the Studium, uncle of Theodore the Studite, was making a speech, roundly condemning the spurious Council of Hieria. But so great was the opposition of

[27] *Vita Stephani P. G., c.* 1121–23.
[28] *Theophanes P. G.*, cviii, 897.
[29] *P. G.*, cviii, 904.

a section of the soldiery that the venue of the council was changed to Nicæa, and there in the presence of papal legates it opened in September, 787. The bishops numbered 350. The Patriarch Tarasius presided.[30]

The empress sent a letter to be read. In it she said that the epistle of Pope Hadrian must be read according to the rule of councils. "By listening to it, together with the two quaternions sent from the patriarchs and bishops of the East, you will know what is the sense of the Catholic Church."

Hadrian makes the usual Roman claims. He speaks of "your Mother, the Roman Church."..He counsels them to follow the traditions of Peter and Paul, princes of the apostles.

At the end of the letter the pope complains of the choosing of a layman to be consecrated patriarch, which complaint he also reiterated in a letter to Tarasius himself.[31]

When these were finished the papal representatives asked whether the Patriarch Tarasius consented to the letters of the most holy Pope of Older Rome. Tarasius replied that St. Paul (Rom. i. 8) had praised the faith of the Romans, Hadrian had that faith, Tarasius therefore confirmed the epistle.

The council is asked by the legates whether it accepts Hadrian's Epistles. The members answer: "We follow, we receive, we accept." The letter of Hadrian, claims a Roman Catholic writer, was taken "as the true faith. No former council had dealt with images, Rome alone had defended them. The bishops simply declare their adhesion to the faith of Rome which had been praised by S. Paul."[32]

The two Roman legates were the Archpresbyter Peter and the Abbot Peter of S. Sabas. Their names occur first in the Acts, then that of Tarasius, Patriarch of Constantinople, then those of the two Eastern monks and priests John and Thomas representing the Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem.

With the exception of the Roman legates and the two representatives of these Eastern Churches, all the bishops were of the Byzantine Church.

The bishops of Antioch wrote that they would accept the council as œcumenical, "*more especially as the most holy and apostolic Pope of Rome agreed, and was present by his envoys.*"[33] Tarasius wrote to Pope Hadrian:

[30] Mansi, xii, 992. "Apparently," says Fortescue, "because the legates could not speak Greek," *Art. cit.*, p. 622.

[31] Probably this part was not read out to the Council. Mansi, xii, 1077, *seq.*

[32] Chapman, *Op. cit.*, and Soloviev, p. 44.

[33] Mansi, xii, 1134.

" Your Holiness has inherited the see of the divine Apostle Peter. Wherefore lawfully and by the Will of God, You preside over all the hierarchy of the Church."

In this Iconoclastic struggle the popes showed themselves (to borrow the words of Professor Diehl) " the traditional and passionate champions of orthodoxy."[34]

. . . . .

But the relation of the Eastern Church to Rome at this time is well studied in a nearer view of one of the protagonists in the Iconoclastic controversy, Theodore of the Studium.

Than S. Theodore of the Studium (759-826)[35] the East has produced few more attractive and accomplished saints. But though his signal eloquence, his versatility, his wonderful administrative power as shown in being the revered ruler of a thousand monks, his piety and extraordinary selflessness, mark him out as one among ten thousand ; he is for our purpose particularly notable, in that he is so outspoken and fearless a defender of the authority, rights, and freedom of the Church against Erastian Eastern emperors, and more especially one of the last great Eastern upholders of the *privilegium Petri* and of the Roman see

" the first among the Churches of God, the source of orthodoxy ever pure and limpid, the shelter against the tempests of heresy."[36]

Fifteen years of his life were spent in three exiles. The first was the result of his protest against the emperor, Constantine VI, putting away his lawful wife Mary the Armenian, and taking in her place Theodote, a lady-of-honour of his mother's. Tara-

[34] *Cambridge Mediæval History*, vol. iv, p. 8. Soloviev, p. 29, *seq.*, speaks of " *Le siège apostolique de Rome—cette icône miraculeuse du christianisme universel.*"

For the ὅρος of the Seventh General Council, see Mansi, xiii, 374, and Hefele-Leclerq, *t.* iii, p. 772, *seq.*

[35] Ehrhard says that Theodore of the Studium is " perhaps the most ingenious of the defenders of the cult of images," Krumbacher, *Byz. Litter.*, p. 150. See also Nilles, *Kalendarium*, i, 321–327, and Dvornik, *Les Slaves, Byzance et Rome*, p. 109, *seq.* Alice Gardner, *Theodore of Studium.*

[36] See below, p. 306 and Dvornik, p. 124 for the terms in which Theodore acclaims the pope, though the author writes, p. 125 : " *Il ne faut pas exagérer la portée des déclarations du Studite et de ses adhérents. Ce ne fut pas toujours l'amour de l'orthodoxie qui les amenait à se tourner vers Rome. Ce qui les inspirait, c'était tout autant le désir de faire opposition aux empereurs qui les persécutaient, aux patriarches nommés par eux et qui avaient d'autres idées que les moines sur les rapports de l'Eglise et de l'Etat. Par opportunité, les Studites croyaient devoir utiliser ce moyen, le seul, pensaient-ils, qui fût propre à sauvegarder pour le moment l'unité de l'Eglise byzantine.*"

sius the Patriarch protested too, but eventually compromised and capitulated, though he would take no part in the new marriage which was blessed by a priest named Joseph. Theodore and his saintly uncle, Plato, for their brave antagonism were exiled from the monastery of Saccudion, the former to Thessalonica. But the exile only lasted a few months. A palace revolution brought death to the emperor and return for Theodore, who received from the pope congratulations on his courage.

Meanwhile the Arabs were ravaging the country, and it seemed safer to move to Constantinople. Thus it was that Theodore brought his monks to the Studion, a monastery so named after its founder, the consul Studius, and whence Theodore derived his title " the Studite." The years of peace and wonderful activity of the varied intellectual life of the Studion were at last broken in upon when the Patriarch Tarasius died in 806 and the Emperor Nicephorus made choice of a namesake, a layman, to succeed him. Plato and Theodore were indignant that only a few days, and Nicephorus was rushed through all the sacred Orders to the Episcopate. For their opposition they were given twenty-four days in prison, while Joseph, the priest who had blessed the unlawful marriage of Constantine, the previous emperor, was recalled, his office of grand steward restored to him, and his priesthood revived.

Again they protested that the rehabilitation of Joseph was against the canons, but the letter of Theodore to the Patriarch Nicephorus went unanswered. But this of course was owing to the emperor's influence.

> " As for the actual patriarch, what use is it to speak of him ? He does not reply to us and does not wish to hear us ; he is in everything under the orders of the emperor. For myself, I will not betray the truth."

But Nicephorus would see the error of his compromise and would later suffer for his principles—dethronement and banishment.

A synod was decided upon by the emperor, and this, which Theodore stigmatised as the " second synod of the adulterer," decreed that the second marriage of Constantine VI was lawful, in that a dispensation had been granted, that emperors were not subject to the law of the Church, and that the examples of S. John Baptist and S. John Chrysostom were useless and valueless to justify the opposition of the monks, that each bishop had authority over the sacred canons and could dispense from them,

and that whoever did not accept these conclusions would be excommunicated.

For Theodore and Plato there followed exile to Principo. But the monks were still loyal to their abbot, in spite of dispersal, threats, arguments, persecutions.

The question had now become, not a mere matter of ecclesiastical discipline, but one of the very foundations of the Church. And now Theodore appeals to the Apostolic See. In his first letter, which he inscribes—

> " To the most holy and great Father of Fathers, to our lord Leo, apostolic pope, Theodore, the most humble priest and abbot of the Studion."

He writes from his prison—

> " Since it is to the great Peter that Christ our God gave the keys of the kingdom of heaven and entrusted the dignity of chief of the flock, it is to Peter, that is to say his successor, that one ought to submit every innovation which is made in the Catholic Church by those who turn aside from the truth. That is what we humble and lowly monks have learnt from the ancient Fathers. Therefore, a new teaching having arisen recently in the midst of our Church here, we believed we ought, first through the medium of one of our fathers, the most holy archimandrite Epiphanius, and then by this simple letter, to submit it to the angel of your supreme Beatitude.
>
> " There has been held, O Ruler divine of all rulers, a synod of prevaricators, as saith the prophet Jeremias, a council of adulterers. These men have not been content to conspire in favour of the priest who blessed the adulterous marriage and to receive him into communion, but, to merit the name of perfect heretic, have excommunicated in a second synod all those who do not cleave to their error, or rather the Church Catholic itself."

And then after commenting on their setting aside all law as we saw above, he continues :

> " I borrow now the cry of the *coryphæus* of the apostles, calling Christ to his succour when the waves of the sea were risen up, and I say to Your Blessedness who art the Representative of Christ ' *O First Shepherd of the Church which is under heaven,*' save us now, we perish. Imitate the Christ your Master, stretch out your hand to your Church as he stretched out his hand to Peter. Peter began to sink in the

waves, whilst our Church is still once more submerged in the depths of heresy. Emulate, we beg you, the great pope whose name you bear, and just as he on the appearance of the Eutychian heresy, stood erect spiritually as a lion with his dogmatic letters, so in your turn (I dare to say it because of your name) roar divinely, or rather send forth your thunders against the present heresy. For if they, usurping an authority which does not belong to them, have dared to convene a heretical council, while *those who, following ancient custom, have not even the right of convoking an orthodox one without your knowledge,* it seems absolutely necessary, we dare to say it to you, that Your Divine primacy should call together a lawful council, so that the Catholic dogma may drive away heresy and that neither Your primacy may be anathematised with all the orthodox by these new voices without authority, nor that wills evilly disposed may find in this adulterous council an excuse for being involved in sin. It is in order to obey Your Divine authority as Chief Pastor that we have set forth these things as it befitted our nothingness, we the least members of the Church. For the rest we beg Your Holiness to count us among your sheep and to enlighten and to strengthen us by your holy prayers. . . It is of myself, a humble fisherman held in prison, that I write to you this letter, because my Father and companion the monk, as well as my brother the Archbishop of Thessalonica, are imprisoned in other islands. But they say the same things as I, and with me prostrate themselves at the sacred feet of Your Blessedness."[37]

The pope later sent a letter full of encouragement and blessing.

To the archimandrite Basil of the monastery of Saint Sabas in Rome Theodore wrote :

" We desired to be helped by the mediation of the first see and by the authority which comes from God, but we did not yet dare to ask such a favour. Now that God has put the thought in his heart, although unworthy, we ask this boon. May it be for the glory of God and for the greatest benefit of the Church, for just as there is but one Lord, one Faith, one God, so there is but one Church, although she rules from among you. Therefore in caring for us you are defending your own interests.[38]

[37] *P. G.*, xcix, 1017. Ep. i.
[38] Mai. Ep. 192, *t.* viii, p. 164.

Theodore recurs again and again to his declaration of the subordination of the emperor, like any other man, to the Church. "God receiveth not the person of any man." The "adulterer" party pretend that laws yield to or do not exist for kings, but where is then the Gospel of the Kings?

> "We believed [he tells the pope], we the humble children of the Catholic Church, that it was necessary to inform you about this, you the first of Pastors and our Apostolic Chief."

Epiphanius, one of Theodore's messengers, brought back the news that his enemies were at work even at Rome insinuating that he himself was involved in heretical compromises.

> "It is strange [Theodore remarks] that we who suffer for Catholic truth should have heretical sentiments. Silence to every mouth that accuses us and calumniates us. We are orthodox although sinners, O Blessed Father, and we profess without any alteration the apostolic Faith. We recognise every general council and private one if it is approved, with all the holy canons which are enacted there; we detest and anathematise all heresies and heretics [he names those with whom he is accused of communicating] . . . As for us we are pure from every heretical sentiment, thanks to your most holy prayers, O most venerable of Fathers."[39]

It should be observed here that the power and authority of Rome are recognised even by the opponents of Theodore, since they take care to have their representations made at the papal throne. The death of the Emperor Nicephorus ended the exile and the struggle for the time being. With the accession of Michael Rhangabe, Nicephorus the patriarch was able, after five years delay to send his synodal letters to Rome, and Joseph the priest was deposed at the demand of Theodore, who seemed to foresee the trouble that that worthy would still cause.

In this struggle, then, we have seen Theodore "submitting everything—words, acts, writings—to the supreme judgment of Rome." He saw in the pope the guarantee of orthodoxy, the guardian of Catholic Faith and morals, and the only counterbalance against that encroachment of the emperors in the domain of things spiritual which has always been the curse of the Byzantine Church.

. . . . . .

The Iconoclastic controversy now bursts forth again, to trouble the tranquillity of the returned hegumenos and to

[39] *P. G.*, xcix, 1021. Ep. 34 and 35.

hinder the exceeding prosperity of the Studium. Michael's short reign was ended, and now Leo the Armenian ruled, chosen by the army to whom Iconoclasm was dear. To gain his end—the victory of Iconoclasm—he calls a council, and Theodore is there. The monarch opens proceedings by reminding the assembly that the Law of Moses forbade every image, and Leo the Isaurian and Constantine had destroyed the images and forbidden their cultus.

When one considers the ridiculous heights to which kingship was carried in the Byzantine empire, one can appreciate the boldness of the protest that Theodore dared to make:

> "O Emperor, since you provoke us to ask questions and to reply, here is what we answer first of all: Ecclesiastical affairs are the province of priests and doctors, the emperor has the administration of external things. That is what the apostle says (1 Cor. xii, 28) "God placed in His Church, first apostles, then prophets then doctors," and nowhere does he make mention of emperors. To the former it belongs to take decisions touching dogmas and the faith, it is your duty to obey them and not to usurp their function."[40]

"Therefore you to-day reject me from the Church," hotly retorted the emperor. "It is not I, but the divine apostle," came the reply, "or rather it is yourself who have forestalled it, in separating yourself from her by your actions." If the emperor wished to return to the Church, let him venerate the image of Christ. No wonder the council broke up in a hurry and discussion of the question was forbidden by edict, and that after a great Palm Sunday demonstration of his thousand monks, each carrying in solemn procession an ikon, Theodore was again, for the third time, exiled.[41]

The patriarch, Nicephorus, also was banished, Leo having effected his deposition by means of a packed assembly of bishops. The courage and staunchness of Nicephorus was a source of great joy to him who formerly had been his opponent.

It was in the fortress of Metopa that Theodore was now confined, but he still by word and letter continued his fight for orthodoxy. However, his enemies, thinking he was too near the capital, removed him to Bonita,[42] but he still had opportunity to exhort those who came to him, and at length he was banished to Smyrna.

[40] *Vita*, 181. *P. G.*, xcix.
[41] Nilles, *Kalendarium*, ii, 515, *seq.*
[42] See *Echos d'Orient*, Art. Bonita.

One of his letters written from Bonita chancing to come into the emperor's hands was the cause of his further removal. It contained this passage :

> " As for us, we think as the Church Apostolic and Universal thinks, for this Church of Byzantium is a heretical branch, and it is its wont to separate itself from others in many ways."

In spite of spies, Theodore was able to keep in touch with the distant world. He finds disciples willing to act as messengers ; Denys to Rome, Euphemius twice to the abbot of a Roman monastery, Epiphanius also to Rome, while others carry his epistles to the Palestinian monastery of S. Sabas in the same city.

Just as Theodore had appealed to the pope in the matter of the divorce, so now, in this revival of the Iconoclastic controversy, he writes in his own name and in that of several archimandrites to Pope Paschal :

> " Your Supreme Blessedness has doubtless learnt what misfortune our sins have drawn upon our Church. We have become, to speak as the Scripture, the conversation and proverb of all the nations, but maybe You have not yet been fully informed by letter. This is why we humble monks and the least among the members of Christ, since our chief is a prisoner, and the first among our fathers are scattered hither and thither, have been able, thanks to your vicinity and to our common agreement in mind and words, to write you this letter, though it be very bold. Listen to us, O Apostolic Leader, set over by God to be the guide of the sheep of Christ, Doorkeeper of the heavenly kingdom, Rock of the Faith, on which has been built the Catholic Church. For You are Peter, You are the Successor of Peter, whose See You occupy with honour. Cruel wolves have broken into the fold of the Lord and Hell as before has risen up against it. . . . Come to our assistance, arise and do not repulse us to the end. To You Christ our God said, ' When thou art once converted, strengthen thy brethren.' Now is the time and the place. Help us You who have been set by God for that purpose. Stretch out the hand as far as possible. Frighten, we beg You, the monsters of heresy with the flute of Your Divine speech. O Good Shepherd, we conjure You, give Your life to your sheep. May the Church which is under heaven learn that those men are smitten with anathema, they who had this audacity and who anathematise our holy Fathers.

You would do a work thereby pleasing to God, it would be a joy for saints and angels, a support for those who waver, a confirmation for those who are strong, a resurrection for those who have fallen, a joy for all the orthodox Church, and for Your Primacy, according to the expression of those of old, an eternal memory."[43]

Next year Theodore wrote again and inscribed his letter

"To the most Holy Father, Supreme Light of the Universe, Prince of Bishops, our Lord and Master."

He knew that Theodotus, the patriarch intruded into the place of the dethroned Nicephorus, had sent his envoys to Rome, hoping to influence the pope in his favour. Theodore writes:

"From the height of heaven the glittering sun of the morning has sent us its rays, Christ our God has established Your Blessedness in the West on the first Apostolic See as a divine torch for the illumination of the Church which is under heaven. Yes, we beheld Your spiritual light, who were surrounded with the shadows and mortal darkness of a perverse heresy. But we scattered the mist of our sadness, we opened our hearts to radiant hopes, when we learnt from our brethren sent to You all the great things said and done by Your Holy Primacy. You did not admit into Your Sacred Presence the heretical deputies, but You sent them back when they were yet far off. On the other hand, You sympathised with our misfortunes as with the misfortunes of Your own sheep; our letters being read and our messengers heard immediately. And, indeed, we humble monks recognise as evident Successor of the Prince of the Apostles the Bishop who presides over the Church of Rome, and we are certain that God has not abandoned the Church of our country, because Divine Providence has reserved for it since the beginning, in the present conjunctures, His assistance which He gives by You and by You alone. For You are truly the Source always pure from the beginning and always clear, of Orthodoxy; You are the tranquil port where the whole Church finds sure shelter against all the tempests of heresy, You are the Citadel chosen by God to be the Assured Refuge of Salvation."[44]

Pope Paschal, as a result of these epistles, sent an embassy

[43] *P. G.*, xcix, 1152, Ep. ii, 12.

See Dvornîk, *Op. cit.*, p. 123, *seq.*, on Theodore and the dogmatic primacy of the patriarch of Rome. "*Son rôle dans la lutte iconoclaste devint encore plus important en raison même de la portion qu'il prit a l'égard de Rome.*"

[44] *P. G.*, xcix, 1156.

to the emperor, and, though the latter was little affected, it brought joy to the heart of Theodore.

"Byzantium has shaken off the yoke of the Gospel as a heifer pricked by the goad; she shakes off the harness. She is furiously agitated in the manner of the Corybantes; she is intoxicated with blood as a lioness; as the serpent she stops her ears, she kicks against the censure."

"A Voice made itself heard to warn her, equal to a voice from heaven, the Voice of the Supreme Throne of Rome, What hast thou done? Thou hast denied Christ by forbidding His image, that of the Mother of God and of all the saints. Open your ear to obedience, listen to the words of the Gospel, of apostle, of prophet, of father. But Byzantium did not listen, did not receive these words. She raised her head against Almighty God, outraging Christ and trampling upon His chosen saints."

Here again is another strong passage:

"How profitable the act of the Apostolic West was, is there need to say? It has fortified to the highest degree the spirits of those who fight; could anything more salutary happen? No, the Lord has not for ever abandoned His Church. But He has shown that she still had strength by exciting our brothers of the West to reject the extravagant intoxication of those here and to enlighten those who fight in the night of heresy. But these hardened souls did not wish to open the eyes of their heart. And, I call God and man to witness, they have separated themselves from the body of Jesus Christ and from the See of the *coryphæus* of Pastors to whom Christ delivered the keys of the Faith against which have never prevailed and never will prevail the gates of Hell, that is to say the tongues of heretics, according to the promise of him who lies not. May therefore the most holy and apostolic Paschal, worthy of his name rejoice, for he has well accomplished the work of Peter. May the choir of faithful thrill with joy, because it has seen with its own eyes a bishop equal to our holy fathers of aforetime. For the rest may it be as God shall wish. May the blood of the martyrs water the Church, may the choir of Confessors grow if it please God; it is our joy, our happiness; our sadness is only for those who are lost."

It is necessary to give these lengthy quotations, for they dispose of the assertion that the acknowledgment of the Roman

primacy was only spasmodic—a policy of currying favour to gain support. For he sends letters from his last exile to the Emperor Michael to the same effect. Having paid a deserved tribute to the emperor's decree for the liberation of the exiles, he begs him to allow the cultus of the icons and to renew the union with the Apostolic See.

> " The Catholic Church, since the time of the preaching of the apostles, as paintings and inscribed monuments testify, bears and venerates in the temples and on the vessels and sacred vestments the holy image of Christ, of the Mother of God, of the angels and saints. And yet our church has lately separated from the four patriarchs, and without reason has violated the Christian law. But here is the favourable time, O Emperor, friend of Christ, here is the day of salvation, here is the moment for being reconciled with Christ, under the auspices and the mediation of your authority amicable to peace, the moment for us to unite ourselves to the Church of Rome, *coryphæus* of all the Churches of God, and by her to the three patriarchs ; the moment to glorify with unanimous voice God the Father with the Son and the Holy Spirit, and to solemnise your most pious and desired royalty."

The Emperor's scheme was to call an assembly of Iconoclasts and Catholics in which they could discuss together the question of the images. But against this Theodore is firm. After an opening full of compliments to the monarch in the approved Byzantine style[45] he says that in such a question which concerns God Himself, not even Peter or Paul or one of the angels would dare to make such an innovation as would ruin the whole Gospel.

> " As for entering into a discussion with the heterodox, apostolic precept forbids it."

Then he bids the emperor, if he will not be guided in a decision on any point by their own patriarch,

> " order that the exposition of faith sent from Old Rome be received, following what has been the practice from all time by our fathers. For this Church, O Emperor, imitator of Christ, is the first (ἡ κορυφαιοτάτη) of all the Churches of

[45] cf. Batiffol and Bréhier, *Op. cit.*, p. 73. *"Les Studites eux-mêmes, si hardis dans les opinions qu'ils proposaient sur les rapports entre l'Eglise et l'Etat, pour qui l'empereur ne devait tenir dans l'Eglise que la place d'un simple fidèle, n'ont jamais blamé les marques de vénération qui paraissaient inséparables de sa personne. Bien plus, c'est sur les honneurs dus à l'empereur qu'ils s'appuient pour justifier le culte des images."*

God. Peter is its first bishop, Peter, to whom the Lord said, 'Thou art Peter, etc.'"[46]

However, all this was practically useless, the emperor replying that he had never himself venerated an image, and that he wished to leave the Church as he had found it. He would not have images venerated in Constantinople, though he would tolerate it in the provinces. As for submitting the question and the decision to Rome, that did not at all meet with the emperor's pleasure, nor the restoring of the banished Patriarch Nicephorus to his throne.

Once again in Constantinople—for a space of two years—Theodore, it was hoped, might be gained over to the idea of a conference. He was immovable.

> "It is not a question of human and temporal things of which kings have the power to judge, but it is a question of divine and heavenly dogmas which have been entrusted to those alone to whom God the Word Himself said, 'Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shalt be loosed in heaven.' And who are those who have received this power? The apostles and their successors. And as to emperors and sovereigns, their rôle is to give their concurrence to that which has been decreed. No power has been accorded to them over divine dogma, and if they exercise it, it will not endure."

He reiterates his advice to seek the decision of Rome where "is found the certitude of Faith."[47]

But Theodore's advice was not followed, and later he left the capital, never to return but to die in exile. He breathed his last as his disciples, reading the Psalms aloud to him, came to the most appropriate words: "I will never forget Thy commandments, for with them Thou hast quickened me."[48]

. . . . . .

By the year 842 Iconoclasm was ready for its death-blow. A council gathered at Constantinople affirmed that the definitions of the Seven Œcumenical Councils were the rule of Faith. And next year, March 11, 843, was inaugurated "the Feast of Orthodoxy."

"*La fête de l'orthodoxie,*" *writes F. Dvornîk,* "*clôt cette*

[46] *P. G.*, xcix, 1332.
[47] Ep. ii, 129. *P. G.*, 1417.
[48] Ps. 118, v. 93.

période du travail qui donna à toute la chrétienté la définition des dogmes fondamentaux et la doctrine chrétienne sur la Trinité, la christologie et le culte des Saints."[49]

It looked now as if all the heresies were crushed, as if all differences between East and West had disappeared. As a matter of fact, the Iconoclast controversy had seriously affected the relations between Constantinople and Rome.

> " The papacy emerged from that long dispute completely emancipated politically from the Byzantine empire."[50]

Leo III, we may recall, answered the opposition of Pope Gregory II by scheming to detach Calabria, Sicily, Crete, and Western Illyricum from the Roman obedience to that of the Patriarch of Constantinople. In 751 Stephen II, on the fall of Ravenna to the Lombards, sought help and protection from the Franks, and Pepin gave him former Byzantine territory to be henceforth the temporal property of the papacy.

" Precisely at the time of this religious crisis," writes Duchesne, " an event occurred of considerable importance in the political sphere, which helped greatly to complicate and even to embitter relations between the Latin Church and the Greek. This event was the passing of Rome from under the dependence of the Byzantine empire to the protectorate of the Franks."[51]

All Constantine V's efforts to recover the territory were fruitless, for Charlemagne in 774 solemnly confirmed Pepin's gift, and Byzantium retained only Venice and some other towns in South Italy.

From the accession of Paul I (757) the pope ceases to request of the Byzantine emperor ratification of his election. He applies to the King of the Franks.

. . . . . .

But the year 800 was the fateful year. The Christmas Day of that year, that saw the crown placed by the Pope upon the head of the Emperor of the West, marked the turning-point.

There were many roots of the Schism of Photius, afterwards consummated by Michael Caerularius, but the *chief cause* was this founding of the Frankish empire. It was intolerable to Byzantine pride.[52] All the charges of heresy against the West are after-thoughts. And jealousy would not be lessened when

[49] For the Synodicon read out on the Feast of Orthodoxy, see Nilles, *Kalendarium*, ii, 109, *seq.* Of interest, too, is Nilles ii, pp. 515–8 ; i, p. 369.

[50] *Cambridge Mediæval History*, iv, p. 246.

[51] *Churches Separated*, p. 143 ; also Soloviev, *Op. cit.*, p. 52, *seq.*

[52] F. Dvorník, *Les Slaves, Byzance et Rome au IXe siècle*, pp. 26 and 27.

the popes, after the year 800, applied to the Emperor of the West for the ratification of their election, and when the Easterns noted that with Pope Hadrian the date of the reign of the Eastern emperors ceased to appear in any papal bull, "Emperor and patriarch were ranged against pope and emperor."[53]

[53] N. H. Baynes, *The Byzantine Empire*, p. 54. cf. A. L. Maycock, *Op. cit.*, pp. 37 and 40. Batiffol and Bréhier, *Op. cit.*, p. 21.

PART THREE

CHAPTER XV

PHOTIUS AND HIS SCHISM

It now remains for us to examine the career of Photius and the events which culminated in his Schism—the term we have set ourselves in this investigation.

But before doing so I think it of great service to quote a valuable, if somewhat lengthy, passage from the Orthodox writer to whom reference has from time to time been made—a passage in which he describes the mental outlook and attitude of the men responsible for this break with the West to which the unhappy separation still continuing at this day owes its genesis.

> *" Ce ne fut ni le parti franchement hérétique ni le parti vraiment orthodoxe, qui fixa pour de longs siècles les destinées de l'Orient chrétien. Le rôle décisif dans cette histoire fut joué par un troisième parti qui, tout en occupant une place intermédiaire entre les deux autres, n'était pas cependant séparé d'eux par de simples nuances, mais avait une tendance tout à fait déterminée et poursuivait une politique profondément méditée. La grande majorité du haut clergé grec appartenait à ce parti que nous pouvons appeler semi-orthodoxe, ou plutôt* Orthodoxe—anticatholique. *Ces prêtres, soit par conviction théorique, soit par sentiment routinier, soit par attachement à la tradition commune, tenaient beaucoup au dogme orthodoxe. Ils n'avaient rien en principe contre l'unité de l'Eglise universelle, mais seulement à la condition que le centre de cette unité se trouvât chez eux ; et puisque de fait ce centre se trouvait ailleurs, ils aimaient mieux être Grecs que Chrétiens et acceptaient une Eglise divisée plutôt que l'Eglise unifiée par un pouvoir à leurs yeux étranger et ennemi de leur nationalité. Comme Chrétiens ils ne pouvaient pas être césaro-papistes en principe, mais comme patriotes grecs avant tout, ils préféraient le césaro-papisme byzantin à la papauté romaine."* [1]

[1] Soloviev, *Op. cit.*, p. xxxiii.

The man whose career we have now to trace is *par excellence* an example of this " third party " so admirably described by the Russian savant.

. . . . . .

The Schism of Photius was the last of a series of schisms. But it was the most momentous of them. For it was the beginning of the end of inter-communion between Constantinople and Rome.

The East was unfortunately accustomed to a state of schism. Of the five centuries which lie between the accession of Constantine and the Seventh General Council, more than two hundred years were passed in separation[2] of Constantinople from Rome.

. . . . . .

It cannot be said that this, the critical Schism of Photius' sprang from theological differences, though *theological questions were afterwards made the excuse.*

The frequent breaking out of a state of schism had weakened the sense of the need of communion, and so when in this mental and spiritual atmosphere there arose a brilliant and ambitious man, determined, cost what it might, to hold on to the see into which he had been unlawfully intruded, schism again was likely to ensue. But it was also the culminating point of the struggle between East and West; of the disinclination and repugnance of the Easterns to receive commands from the " barbarian " Westerns. And Photius " *qui réunit en lui toutes les qualités et tous les défauts de l'esprit byzantin*"[3] was just the man to manifest in his own person the hatred and contempt, the rancour and jealousy, that the Easterns had accumulated against the Westerns as the years flowed on.

Photius, as one of the latest writers on the subject truly remarks, had nothing of the apostle in him.[4] He was first and

[2] Duchesne gives a list of the years of the various schisms on p. 109 of his *Churches Separated.*

1. On account of S. Athanasius and Arianism from the Council of Sardica (343) until the succession of S. John Chrysostom to the see of Constantinople (343–398) ...	55 years
2. About the condemnation of Chrysostom (404–415) ...	11 years
3. With regard to Acacius and the Henoticon of Lera (484–519)	35 years
4. On account of Monothelism (640–681)	41 years
5. On account of veneration of images (726–787)	61 years
Total	203 years

[3] Dvorník, *Les Slaves, Byzance et Rome*, p. 118 and *seq.* R. Janin, *Les Eglises orientales*, p. 128.

[4] *Cambridge Med. History*, iv, 255.

foremost a politician and a diplomatist, and this man of boundless ambition knew how to make a personal affair into a national cause.[5] He knew the men around him and he knew the times. He knew how with the greatest skill to turn the feelings engendered by recent events to his own purpose.

Against his private life nothing was ever said, but as regards public life, history has recorded few examples of more inordinate ambition.

Everyone is agreed that Photius was a man of extraordinary gifts and of vast learning. He was, in fact, the greatest scholar of his time. His erudition was truly prodigious, the range and versatility of his genius simply marvellous though[6] "his learning was wide rather than deep." History, strategy, canon law, civil law, literature—religious and secular, medicine, philosophy, grammar, with all these he was familiar. His *Myriobiblion* gives a list of 280 books otherwise unknown to us, which form part of the thousand books which he read, annotated, commented on, and criticised.[7]

. . . . . .

He was born somewhere about the year 815.[8] and as he was related to the imperial family, his brother Sergius having married the emperor's aunt Irene, he lived a good deal of his life at court; and now he, a layman, who had had no idea of receiving holy orders, was, like Nicephorus in the previous century, rushed through all the sacred Orders, and in six days had changed from Secretary of State and Captain of the Life Guards to Patriarch, consecrated by the excommunicated Bishop of Syracuse, Gregory Asbestas.[9]

[5] As Dom Leclercq comments in his translation of Hefele: "*Il sut découvrir le point faible de l'autorité papale dans les esprits orientaux, substituer à son grief personnel cette hostilité inconsciente, révéler celle-ci à elle-même, lui faire entrevoir ce à quoi elle aspirait confusément et conduire l'attaque sur ce terrain sans la laisser désormais s'égarer. Ainsi d'une déconfiture privée il faisait une revendication nationale.*" Hefele-Leclerq, iv, 253, note. See also *Le Culte de Photius dans l'Eglise Byzantines*" (Paris, 1923), by M. Jugie.

[6] See Fortescue, Art. "Photius," *Cath. Encycl.* "His erudition is vast . . . . but he has little originality."

[7] Dvorník, *Les Slaves, Byzance et Rome*, p. 119–120 and the quotation of the remarkable eulogy of Photius from his enemy Nicetas. *P. G.*, cv, 509.

[8] Hergenröther says "not much earlier than 827" (*Photius*, i, 316). Dvorník follows him "*vers* 827" (*Op. cit.*, p. 119). A. Fortescue (*Cath. Encycl.*) says *c.* 815.

[9] There is a good deal of haziness as to what all the dispute between Ignatius and Gregory Asbestas was about (see Fortescue, *Orthodox Eastern Church*, p. 136). Gregory had taken refuge at Constantinople, possibly because of the Arab invasion of Sicily, and for some irregularity or other was condemned by a council. He appealed to the pope, Leo IV. The latter ordered Ignatius to send him the acts of the assembly. It is instruc-

Michael III had succeeded to the imperial throne at the age of three years, his mother Theodora acting as regent, aided by Bardas her brother, with Theoctistus and Manuel forming a council of regency.

The Patriarch Ignatius,[10] a son of the former Emperor Michael Rhangabe, was a man of the greatest moral worth. He had ascended the patriarchal throne on the death of Methodius, a great defender of the images and the papacy, with general satisfaction. The Iconoclastic controversy was practically a thing of the past, and union with Rome restored.

The emperor was now of age to take the reins of government into his own hands, but showed himself a despicable degenerate, and already at the age of seventeen merited his nickname of "The Drunkard"; while the astute Bardas was determined not to relinquish his influence over him, especially as now he could have sole control, for Manuel had retired, and Theoctistus had been assassinated because of an alleged conspiracy.

It is probable that Bardas[11] was quite gratified to see the profligacy of the young emperor, for it gave him the opportunity of concentrating power in himself and bearing the title of Cæsar.

The actual genesis of the Schism was when Bardas put away his lawful wife and lived with his daughter-in-law Eudocia, and the Patriarch Ignatius at Epiphany 858 refused to give him Communion. Michael and Bardas and Gregory Asbestas united against Ignatius, and he was deposed and exiled, but "Ignatius had not resigned his office, nor did he ever do so," as the Protestant Kattenbusch points out; and this is a fact essential to remember.[12]

And now enters Photius, whose uncle had married Bardas'

tive that the patriarch was unwilling to do so, and there the matter rested. The next pope, Benedict III, refused in 899 to confirm Gregory's deposition, but suspended him until the documents of the case were available. "Thus," writes a recent historian, "though the relations between Rome and Constantinople had once more become normal and the goodwill of Ignatius and the Studites towards the pope was manifestly great, the long separation due to the Iconoclastic dispute had borne fruit; the Greek Church had become accustomed to complete autonomy, as far as Rome went, and its bishops, who fostered feelings of distrust and even hostility against her, only awaited an opportunity to show them. The crisis in the Patriarchate, which was the result of the deposition of Ignatius, soon supplied them with the desired opportunity"—*Camb. Med. History*, iv, 247. See also Bury, *Hist. East Rom. Empire*, 184–5. See also Dvornik, *Op. cit.* p. 180–181. cf. Hergenröther i, 358.

[10] See Dvornik, pp. 131–2.

[11] For Bardas "*l'une des figures les plus intéressantes de l'élite byzantine au IXe siècle*" and the good side of this ambitious character, and his motives in encouraging education, see Dvornik, *Op. cit.*, p. 121.

[12] *Real enzyklopädie* xv. 378.

sister. He is persuaded to take the see which is not vacant. He is consecrated to it by Gregory Asbestas, an enemy of Ignatius and excommunicate by him ; and, because excommunicate, conferring a consecration necessarily irregular.[13]

Photius however was very anxious to get the ratification and approval of Rome for his election. But he had a formidable personage to encounter in Nicholas I, the greatest pontiff since Gregory the Great, who " ruled kings and tyrants and subjected them to his authority as if he were the lord of the world."[14] Photius wrote to him to obtain his recognition. " This step in itself," remarks the writer, in the *Cambridge Mediæval History*, " shews that Photius at that time accepted generally the jurisdiction of the pope."[15] He wrote craftily—how unwillingly he had been forced into the patriarchal see in place of Ignatius compelled by infirmity and age to retire, and he protested his devotion to the Apostolic See.[16] And his envoys bore rich vestments and presents to the pope.[17]

The pope was suspicious—he evidently thought things seemed a little over-done—he would make enquiries on the spot by means of the legates whom he would send to the proposed council. (It was as a part of the ingenious scheme of Photius to get the approval of the pope to his succession that he proposed a council to put an end to the Iconoclastic controversy.) The judgment, however, on the facts of the whole affair of Ignatius he would reserve to himself.

Then he wrote to Photius :

> " Your letter has given us great joy learning that you are Catholic. . . But we much regretted that you did not continue to follow the right line, that you left all at once the lay state to mount to a post so elevated. . . Also we cannot consent in any way to your consecration until the return of those whom We have sent to Constantinople so that we may know by their report your conduct and your love for the truth. Then only, if you are worthy of it, will we render to you the honours due to the bishop of so great a see, and will embrace you with fraternal love."[18]

[13] " By this act Photius committed three offences against canon law : he was ordained bishop without having kept the interstices, by an excommunicate consecrator, and to an already occupied see. To receive ordination from an excommunicate person made him too excommunicate *ipso facto* "—Dr. A. Fortescue in Art. " Photius," in *Cath. Encycl.*

[14] *P. L.*, cxxviii, 612. cf. Maycock, *The Papacy*, p. 39.

[15] *Cambridge Med. History*, iv, p. 248.

[16] *P. G., cii.*, 585.

[17] *Liber Pontificalis*, ii, 154. Duchesne.

[18] *Ep.* iii.

Rodoald, Bishop of Porto, and Zacharias, Bishop of Anagni, the legates, were hardly equal to their task. They were rigorously kept away from Ignatius and his partisans. Flattery and threats, gifts and insults, in turn, brought it about that they were quite taken in by the Greeks and betrayed their mission and supported the intrusion of Photius.

The council which Photius had proposed took place in the Church of the Apostles. But there was little said about Iconoclastic quarrels. That had been only a " blind." The question of Ignatius was paramount. From the report which Ignatius himself sent to the pope one gets a pretty graphic account of the unedifying proceedings. The letter is inscribed :

> Ignatius, tyrannically deposed and much tried, and his fellow-sufferers, ten metropolitans, fifteen bishops and many archimandrites, priests and monks, to our Lord, the most holy and blessed Patriarch of all Sees, the successor of the Prince of the Apostles the Œcumenical Pope Nicholas, and to the most holy bishops under him and to all the most wise Church of the Romans, health in the Lord.

Ignatius had appealed to the pope immediately after the intrusion of Photius, but the appeal, though entrusted on oath to a priest Laurence, and to two Stephens, one a deacon and one a layman, had never reached Rome.

When his presence was demanded at the council (861) in the Church of the Apostles, Ignatius refused, and appealed to the Pope. Again cited to appear, he came arrayed in his patriarchal vestments, but was forcibly stripped of his insignia of rank by an envoy from the emperor, and, as if already condemned, was compelled to appear habited as a simple monk. His own treacherous messengers Laurence and the two Stephens arrived at this juncture and ostentatiously separated themselves from him. Photius unjustly and scandalously sat among the judges, and when Ignatius saluted the Roman legates and asked who they were, and they answered, " We are the legates of Pope Nicholas, sent to judge your case," " Then," retorted he, " dismiss first of all the adulterer " [for so he described Photius who had unlawfully taken his see]; "if you cannot, do not be my judges." " *C'était un sanglant rappel a l'ordre, une allusion vengeresse aux prescriptions des canons qui exigeaient qu'un évêque fût rétabli sur son siège avant d'être jugé.*" [19] But the legates, indicating the emperor, could only make answer, " He wishes it thus." The proceedings fail to break the resolution of Ignatius or move

[19] Ruinaut, *Le Schisme de Photius*, p. 19.

him from his position. Some days later the Stephens come to summon him to the council again,

> " I am not going there," he replied, " for I do not think that you judges are acting at all according to ecclesiastical rule. . . I do not acknowledge such judges ; but conduct me to the Pope, and I will bear with joy his judgment."

He demanded that the letters which he had written justifying his action should be read, and he referred to the instance of S. John Chrysostom's appeal to Innocent and the decree that John was not to present himself for judgment before he had been previously re-established in his see. He quotes also the 4th Canon of Sardica, laying down that a deposed bishop, if he believed that he could still justify himself, ought not to be replaced on his throne before the sentence of the Bishop of Rome had been given.

> " Apparently, Fathers, you have not read the canons and do not know the rule of the Church. This rule demands that a bishop cited to the council should be summoned thrice and by two bishops, but you have cited me but twice, and that by a deacon and a layman. Unworthy witnesses have sworn that I had been elected and consecrated irregularly, but what canon orders that the emperor should produce witnesses ? If I am not archbishop, Michael is not emperor, and these are not bishops, nor ' the adulterer '[20] himself, for all have been consecrated by my unworthy hands. If the adulterer belonged to the Church I would willingly yield to him. But can I give a stranger as shepherd to the sheep of Christ ? Many reasons oppose themselves ; first of all he has been excommunicated, not only by me and by other sees, but by yourselves ; further, he has been taken from among the laity and installed shepherd before having been sheep ; finally, he has been ordained by an excommunicate, Gregory of Syracuse."

All this is from his account sent subsequently to the pope, which ends with this appeal to the pontiff :

> " I have made known these things to you in a few words. As to you, my most holy lord, manifest in my regard your bowels of mercy and say with great Paul, ' Who is weak and I am not weak ?' Remember the patriarchs your predecessors. I may mention Fabian, Julius, Innocent, Leo, those, in a word, who have fought for truth against injustice.

[20] This, as Dr. Fortescue remarks, is one of the amenities of theological controversy, p. 139, *Op. cit.*

Rival them and rise up to avenge him who has suffered so many injustices."[21]

For ten days he was submitted to all kinds of indignities and insults and injuries, then, forced to attend the council, he was put through the solemn mockery of a condemnation, seventy-two witnesses as required for the condemnation of a bishop having been suborned to testify against him. The metropolitan of Ancyra, who dared to raise his voice in protest, was a few days after found assassinated at the emperor's orders. The deposition was hypocritically affected to be based on the violation of the 30th Apostolic Canon: "If a bishop has made use of the secular power to get possession of a Church he ought to be deposed and excommunicated." One would have thought this more applicable to Photius' own case!

A show of interest in destroying Iconoclasm, calculated to impress and deceive the pope and influence him in their favour, brought this disgraceful council to an end; while the chief characters in it, Photius, Michael and Ignatius, followed by sending each an epistle to the pope. The emperor's letter informed the pope that Ignatius had been deposed by a great majority of bishops—his own papal legates approving—on the ground of Canon 30 of the apostolic canons. For justification of Photius he referred to the cases of Ambrose and Tarasius.

The letter of Photius once more vehemently asserted his unwillingness to accept the patriarchal throne. All the same he took the trouble to support with his arguments the justification and precedents given in the emperor's letter. He protested, too, his devotion to the Apostolic See. He writes:

"In order to prove our obedience to Your Fatherly Love in all things";

and he warned the pope not to believe those who would cast doubts on his loyalty.

It was all very conflicting and perplexing, and the Pope was still suspicious and unconvinced, although the letters had been sent by the Emperor and brought by his own secretary of State, Leo, and the substance of them was supported by the Pope's own legates.

Nicholas was prudent. He answered the letters without giving a definite decision, but took the opportunity of pointing out certain facts: the peculiarities in the election of Photius—the fact that Ignatius had occupied the see of Constantinople undisputed for twelve years—that, regularly elected by the

[21] Mansi, xvi, 296, *seq.*

synod, he had hitherto been always honoured by the Emperor. The precedents invoked proved nothing if they looked into their circumstances. Nectarius had been chosen because it was difficult to find anyone not infected with heresy; Tarasius because of his devoted services to the Church. But even then Pope Hadrian had taken care to point out its uniqueness. "If you had not shown so much zeal for the re-establishment of the images against those who trod them beneath their feet, we should never have consented to your consecration, and we should not have recognised your claim of patriarch, for a promotion so irregularly made is against the apostolic decrees," while S. Ambrose owed his election to a miracle.

The Pope wrote also to the faithful of the East, that the Acts of the council were null, because it dealt with a case that was reserved to himself—one that he alone was competent to deal with. Ignatius therefore was their lawful Patriarch until the Pope ruled the contrary by canonical judgment.

These letters would not make the position of Photius a happy one. And when at length the letter of Ignatius to the Pope arrived in Rome (conveyed thither by his friend Theognostus, who was head of the Latin monastery at Constantinople)—when Nicholas now clearly saw how he had been deliberately deceived by Photius and Michael—how scandalously his legates had betrayed their trust and mission—when he knew now all about the irregular ordination by the excommunicate Gregory Asbestas and the cruelties physical as well as mental inflicted on Ignatius—he knew that his prudence and caution in dealing with Photius had been well judged.

He called a council of all the bishops of Italy—the legates were deposed and excommunicated (Rodoald was in the West on an embassy, Zacharias was present and confessed his wrongdoing). Thus being possessed of confirmation of the chicanery of Photius and Gregory, which Ignatius' letter had related, excommunication was pronounced against them, and Ignatius declared to be the lawful Patriarch.

Photius' position in Constantinople would now be still less happy. But he was, with so much skill and craft, not likely to yield. "*L'ambition de Photius sut merveilleusement exploiter le mécontentement que, depuis des siècles, l'Orient ressentait des prétentions du pape, et l'hostilité qu'il éprouvait contre l'Occident habilement, en face des revendications de la primauté romaine, il sut faire de sa cause personelle une véritable cause nationale.*"[22]

[22] C. Diehl, *Histoire de l'Empire Byzantin.* p. 88
cf. Dvorník, *Op. cit.*, p. 132. "*On recommençait à mettre Byzance en*

There can be little doubt that the insolent vulgar letter which the Emperor sent to the Pope was Photius' composition or inspiration. "The Drunkard" Michael would hardly be intellectually capable of that. It ridiculed the papal authority, laid base charges against the Pope, laughed at the Latin language as a "barbarian" and "Scythian" tongue, and finished by threatening to come and lay waste and destroy Rome itself, the tottering city visibly condemned to perish.

The letter which Nicholas sent in reply to this effusion was in every way a contrast. It is a model of dignity, and eloquently sets forth the claims which Rome made. It is a lengthy epistle and deserving to be read in its entirety. He skilfully mingles irony and raillery with his charity, energy and sternness. It is an exact illustration of his character as described by the contemporary whom we have already quoted. "Kind, humble, gentle to good bishops and priests and pious laymen; terrible and stern to evildoers. Rightly do people say that in him God raised up a second Elijah." (*P.L.* cxxviii, 612.)

"We had," he writes, "already drawn up a letter for you such as a very illustrious son receives from an affectionate father and a priest of God, such as the bishops of the Apostolic See are accustomed to send to emperors, when the letter of your Magnificence was delivered."

"Since that letter is full of blasphemies and abuse, Our joy was changed to sadness and tears stifled our voice. We expected grapes from a good Vine, we received only wild fruits." He goes on: "You have started your letter by abuses, We begin ours with prayers. You have first of all heaped invectives, not only on our person, but even on the First and Mistress of all the Churches; while We on Our part open our mouth to sing your praises and to ask in the Name of the Lord the increase of your power. . . Are We not indeed the disciples of Him of whom the Prince of the Apostles said 'Who when He was reviled, reviled not again, when He suffered He threatened not'?"

Later on the Pope mentions the example of Constantine, who, having had some accusations against some bishops made to him, had them come before him, and in their presence burnt the libellous accusation. "You are gods," he said, "established by the true God; go, settle your own affairs among yourselves, because it is not right that we should judge gods." Even pagans, says Nicholas, respect their priests, although devoted

parallèle avec les autres nations et surtout avec Rome, non sans orgueil et sans flatterie. Or, plus que tout autre de ses contemporains, Photius cultivait ce sentiment national et caressait cet orgueil de la grandeur byzantine," et seq.

to idolatry. "We also," he continues, "are a sinner and unworthy, but We hope more in the divine mercy than in your piety. . . . You ought not to examine who the priests of God are, but what they say in the Name of the Lord. You have not to enquire into what the Vicars who sit on the Throne of Peter are, but only what they endeavour to do for the reformation of the Churches and for your own salvation. You will not say indeed that they are inferior to the Scribes and Pharisees who sit on Moses' seat, but this is what the Lord said of them: 'All things that they shall say to you observe and do, but do not after their works.' Consider, therefore, this, O Emperor; if it was necessary to obey those who were seated upon the seat of Moses, ought not people with far stronger reason to obey those sitting on the seat of Peter?"

Then further on he writes: "As for the affronts that you have directed against the Roman Church, which tend towards the diminution of its privileges and to the lowering of the authority of the bishops of the Apostolic See, we must refute them with energy, without allowing Ourselves to be moved by any fear or by any threats on your part. You say 'since the Sixth Synod a pope has never received from the emperor such an honour.' You allude to your letter. . . . If your predecessors have not addressed themselves to the see of Peter, that is not a dishonour to Us but to them; for they have never sought to bring remedy to the heresies when they have been produced; they have, on the contrary, refused these remedies when they have been presented to them. . . . It is true that since that time (Gregory III) there have been very few Catholic emperors, but those who have been, such as Constantine and the Empress Irene, have really addressed themselves to Rome."

The other sovereigns treated the pope with respect in their intercourse. "We ask," "we pray," "we invite you," were their terms. "You, on the contrary, as if you were only the heir of their empire and not at all of their good feeling and of their respect, give orders; you give commands as to one of your subjects."

The pope bestows some well-deserved ridicule *à propos* of his ill-bred sneer at the Latin tongue. "If you call it barbarian because you do not understand it, see how ridiculous it is for you to call yourself Emperor of the Romans and to be ignorant of the Roman language!"

"At the beginning of your letter, indeed, you entitle yourself Emperor of the Romans, and you are not afraid, however, of calling the Latin tongue barbarous. Cease then entitling

yourself Emperor of the Romans, for if one believes you, they are barbarians of whom you call yourself the emperor, since they use the language which you call barbarous and Scythian. Banish this hated language from your palace, and, if you detest it so much, take steps to drive it from your churches. For people say that at Constantinople, in the stations, the epistle and the gospel are read in Latin before they are read in Greek. . . . You say that when you sent to Us, it was not to have Ignatius judged a second time, but what has passed proves that such was, however, your intention. As for Us, we simply wished that the affair should be examined with care and that a detailed report should then be made to base on these data our judgment. . . . If Ignatius, as you say, had already been judged, why have you caused him to be judged a second time contrary to that which is written in the scripture. '*Non judicabit bis in idipsum*'? But no, you have had him judged afresh because you regarded the first judgment as null. You asked for legates in order to give more authority to the condemnation."

Pope Nicholas proves the nullity of the proceedings by references to the decretals of popes, canons of councils, and even the civil laws of Justinian, and he vigorously protests against the presence of the emperor in their council and the unseemliness of the unauthorised spectators.

"The superior has been subject to the judgment of his inferiors, although the holy canons, the examples of the Fathers prove to us that one ought always to address oneself to the highest authority and in all disputes to remit the judgment to the holder of the most exalted see. That is a rule that has always been observed, not only by Catholics, but even by heretics too. Besides, the council where this question was discussed was without authority . . . ."

The pontiff says he felt inclined to laugh at the emperor's saying that the number of the bishops in the council equalled those in the Council of Nicæa—as if that gave it authority. Let him call it then the Seventh or the Eighth General Council!

"What serves it you to have borrowed from this holy synod the number of persons present, when by your doctrines you have furiously exalted yourself against it?"

He reminds him how he (the pope) had been asked to send legates to settle, once for all, the Iconoclastic controversy, when in reality it was a scheme to get him to take part in a cruel and unjust act—the expulsion of Ignatius—and to obtain the sanction of the Apostolic See for it. To the rest of the letter he had not been able to reply because of illness, and because

the emperor's envoy was in a hurry to get away, since winter was coming on. This letter he might get to him at Ostia. But the chief reason that he had not replied to the rest of his letter was that it was so full of blasphemies and "infected with venom against the Divine ordinance which has given to the Roman Church her privileges above all the Churches. This makes us believe that it was not your work and that you were incapable of writing things so false. . . . However, if you are the author of the contemptuous words addressed to blessed Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, and consequently to God, Whose order you resist, words which seek still to diminish the privileges of the most holy Roman Church, then we ought to declare that you have read neither the holy rules, nor the canons of the venerable synods, nor the laws of pious emperors, nor the truthful works of wise men, of which you uselessly endeavour, without competence and without propriety, to remind us as tending to the abasement of so great a Church."

He prays God that the emperor may be granted to know the privileges of the Roman Church and their Author and their authority.

"If you wish to know these privileges through Us, as minister of Christ and dispenser of His mysteries, we will prove them to you with certainty; but if you little care to know them, if you only make great efforts against the privileges of the Roman Church, take care that they do not turn back against yourself. . . . For if you do not listen to us, we shall regard you as Our Lord has commanded those to be regarded who do not listen to the Church. . . . The privileges of this see or of the Church are perpetual. They have been planted and rooted by God Himself. People can strike against them, but cannot change them; they may attack them but not destroy them. They existed before your accession to the empire; they remain, thanks to God, intact; they will remain after you, and, as long as the Name of Christ shall be preached, they will not cease to exist immutable. These privileges have been established by the mouth of Jesus Christ itself. It is not councils which have granted them. They have only honoured and preserved them. . . . Saint Peter and Saint Paul were not brought to us after their death by the authority of princes to augment the authority of the privileges of the Roman Church, as people have done with you irrationally and violently, since people have carried off from other churches their protectors to enrich Constantinople with their booty and their riches, but these apostles came alive to Rome, preached there the word of Life,

destroyed error, enlightened souls with the light of Truth, and consummating their martyrdom for their faith, they on the same day together consecrated the holy Roman Church by their blood. . . . They acquired the Church of Alexandria by Saint Mark, the son and disciple of one of them. For the heritage of the son belongs to the father and the glory of the disciple ought always to be referred to his master. Already blessed Peter had by his presence acquired that of Antioch. . . . It is by these three principal Churches that the solicitude of the Prince of the Apostles attends to the government of all the other Churches. It is necessary to remark besides, that neither the Council of Nicæa nor any other synod has granted a single privilege to the Church of Rome. What they know is that with Peter this see had obtained the plenitude of power and had received the direction of all the sheep of Christ. That is what the blessed Bishop Boniface attests, when he writes to all the bishops established in Thessaly. The Synod of Nicæa was content to accord to the Church of Alexandria a privilege analogous to that which the Roman Church enjoyed."

These were some of the reasons which make him pre-occupied with the concerns of all the Churches.

" They compel us to take ceaseless care in the Church of Constantinople . . . . to aid as a brother the Patriarch Ignatius, dispossessed of his see against every law and every canonical rule. . . . It is equally these privileges of our Church which commanded us under divine inspiration to remove Photius, who has been unduly introduced into the sheepfold of the Lord, who has driven from it the Shepherd and dispersed the Sheep of the honour-giving see, which he has unjustly usurped, and to exclude him from the communion of Christians."

After referring to Theognostus and to the many others whom the emperor would make suffer, and how many had taken refuge at Rome, and that he had no wish to play the part of another Judas, he says :

" Thanks to God, since the blessed Apostles Peter and Paul, we have the power and the right to call to us not only monks, but clerics from all dioceses for the advantage of the Church."

Theognostus has only said what every one in every part of the world says, what, in fact, the emperor's envoys and his own letters imply !

As for the threats of destruction of Rome !

" Do you think we have forgotten the threats of Sennacherib, King of Assyria . . . . against Jerusalem ? . . . Why have you risen up against us ? What evil have we done ? Assuredly

we have not invaded Crete, we have not ravaged Sicily, nor conquered an endless number of provinces subject to the Greeks; we have not set fire to the churches of the saints, causing to perish numerous victims; we have not fired the environs of Constantinople, which almost touch the city. No vengeance is drawn down on those who have committed these crimes who are pagans. . . . It is to us, on the contrary, who are by the Grace of God, Christians . . . . that these threats are directed."

The whole passage, too long to quote here, is full of dignity and forceful gentleness. Nicholas asks that Ignatius and Photius come to Rome, where the case can be examined in an unprejudiced atmosphere. "But it is solely by indulgence that we grant it."

If Ignatius and Photius cannot come themselves, let them send deputies sympathetic with their respective points of view who will fully represent them. He asks for his original letters which he had sent by his untrustworthy legates, to be returned. He wishes to see whether they had been tampered with. He asks too for the authentic Acts of the first council, that which deposed Ignatius. And then he addresses personal exhortation to the Emperor not to separate himself from the communion of the Church:

"If you follow our advice, if you apply yourself to execute that which we ask of you, then, by the authority of the holy Princes of the Apostles, we grant to Your Most Christian and Benevolent Majesty the right of being admitted to communion of the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, specially to Ours, to that of our colleague in the priesthood, Ignatius, and of those of his party; the communion of Gregory and of his schism-makers being alone forbidden you."

His sole desire, as always, is the seeking of the peace of the Church:

"Put far from you the idea that we wish to favour Ignatius contrary to all justice, or to attack Photius if he has the canons of the Church on his side. . . . It is not enmity or hatred which has urged us against the party of Gregory of Syracuse, but the zeal of the house of the Lord, the zeal of the tradition of our ancestors, ecclesiastical order, ancient customs, and the solicitude which We bear towards all the Churches of God. In short, We have already said, they are the privileges of Our Apostolic See, privileges Divinely given to Peter and transmitted to the Roman Church, which the Church Universal celebrates and venerates, which inflame Us and do not allow Us to keep silence and remain indifferent."

The pope urges the emperor to think of eternity and to remember what has happened to emperors like Nero and Diocletian, who have persecuted the Church; what has happened to those like Constantine and Theodosius, who have fostered it. He desires simply his eternal glory. He bids him consider his pious predecessors:

"Examine the laws which they promulgated for uniting the Churches to the Apostolic See, for assembling councils without, however, giving orders on the decisions to be taken. They were content to pray and exhort, they recognised what councils decreed, they condemned those whom they condemned. Thus, then, most dear Son, may Your Sublimity not take your place in the number of the ungrateful and disobedient, but imitate the emperors who have honoured God, and may you receive with obedience what We have decided regarding the Church of Constantinople. We ask this obedience, having under our eyes these words of the Lord: 'He that heareth you, heareth Me, and he that despiseth you despiseth Me.'"

He expatiates at some length on the independence of the two powers—secular and ecclesiastical:

"Before Jesus Christ, there were kings who were also priests like Melchisedech. The Devil imitated that in the person of the pagan emperors who were sovereign pontiffs . . . . Jesus Christ has separated the two powers."

Each authority must confine itself to its own sphere—

"It is perfectly plain that the pope cannot be bound or loosed by a secular power."

He quotes the words of Theodosius II to the Fathers at Ephesus:

"We have sent our Count of the Palace, Candidian, to be present at your most holy Council, but in no wise to mix himself in questions of faith and dogmas. For it is not permitted to one who is not of the episcopal order to interfere with ecclesiastical affairs."

Then having again stressed the wickedness and unlawfulness of the condemnation of Ignatius, he terminates his long epistle by assuring him that his motive in writing is the Emperor's eternal glory rather than his temporal—

"Faithful are the wounds of a friend . . . . Finally We ask you to listen to Us in this life rather than see Us become your accuser at the Last Judgment . . . . May Almighty God, dearest Son, mercifully open your heart to understand what We say to you, and give you grace to obey what We write."

It has been necessary to give these long extracts from this

long letter, because they show clearly what the claims were which Rome made in the ninth century just on the eve of the breaking-out of the schism.[23] Such claims obviously could not have been a sudden discovery, and Nicholas would not have written at such a length had they never previously (in spite of the contentions of Michael's letter) been heard of or acknowledged.

There was, however, no reply to this epistle, and also no invasion of Italy.

. . . . .

Circumstances, however, conspired to help Photius. Difficulties had been facing the pope in two directions, which Photius could profit by or render more difficult, and so strengthen for the time being his own not altogether secure position—the divorce affair of Lothair and the Bulgarian question. There was, first, the affair in the West of Lothair, who had got rid of his wife Thietberga and taken another woman, Valdrada. His wife appealed to Nicholas. The legates and the councils were again influenced adversely. But the pope quashed the proceedings. The interest of this episode in the present connection lies in this: that Photius knew how to turn it to his advantage. There was trouble in the West; he could make trouble in the East. He wrote:

"There have also come to me from Italy complaints against Nicholas. They (*sc.* Thietgand, Gunther and the other bishops who had supported the divorce of Lothair) ask me to come to their aid against the tyranny of the pope."[24] In 867 Photius held a council at Constantinople and *decreed the pope deposed and excommunicated.* Such was his boldness and overweening assessment of his own position at this time.

He knew, however, how to change and modify it when it suited him!

. . . . .

The year before (866) Bardas had been assassinated, and Photius, who owed everything to him, was now quite equal to cursing him, whom before he had blessed. In the sycophantic

[23] cf. Duchesne, *Op. cit.*, p. 146. "One may come to the conclusion that Pope Nicholas, badly or unfortunately advised, started, without due consideration, a most serious quarrel, which it would, at the time, have been easy to avert, and in the course of which the Holy See lost, in the East, much of the consideration it had hitherto enjoyed. Nicholas and several of his successors employed a very determined tone in treaty with Photius. Many of their letters, it is true, failed to reach their destination, and to those that were received by him Photius replied in an equally imperious tone."

[24] *Ep.* ii. cf. *Camb. Med. Hist.*, iv, 249. Bury, *East Rom. Emp.*, p. 200.

letter which he writes to the emperor he heaps abuse upon his dead ally—he is one of those people loaded with favours, dignities and riches who are not content to realise their mediocrity and hold their benefactor in veneration, but consumed with greed and a thirst for power, they lose by their folly what they already possess. And so he moralises on about this man, " vile and abject, for I know not what other name to give him."

It was a wise stroke, very pleasing to Michael, the instigator of his death. With Bardas out of the way, Photius could be even more bold and self-asserting under such a feeble emperor.

Always Photius thinks only of himself—his own advantage and the attaining of his ambitions. He can without compunction discard those who have helped him when he has no longer use for their services—these friends whom he boasts, in his second letter to Pope Nicholas, he is able so easily to make and who love him more than their own parents.[25]

. . . . .

With the object of restoring peace to the Church, Pope Nicholas had, in 866, sent eight epistles to various personages in Constantinople relative to these affairs. But Photius and Michael took care that they should never reach their destination. The envoys who were to bring them to Constantinople on their way to Bulgaria, were prevented by Photius from crossing the frontier.

The manner of Photius and his attitude at this time towards Rome can best be seen from the epistle from which I have already quoted.

" Satan is not yet satisfied with the numerous plagues with which he has covered the Church since Simon the magician and by so frequent heresies. After having conquered all his enemies we could hope to live in peace, especially as at last, the Armenians have returned to the Church and the Bulgarians been made Christians. But, O grief, the Bulgarians have hardly been ten years initiated into the Christian faith than the men of darkness, that is to say those of the West, have descended on this people like wild beasts, to devastate by their false doctrines and their depraved morals this Vine of God newly planted. They had induced the Bulgarians to fast the ' Sabbath Day,' which was forbidden by the 60th Apostolic Canon. Further, they separate the first week of Lent from the time consecrated to the fast, and they permit, during this first week, milk to be drunk and cheese to be eaten. They have not been ashamed to confirm afresh people anointed with chrism by a

[25] *P. G.*, cii, 728 and 597. cf. Appendix XII.

priest, under pretext that it was the office of the bishop. Could any one do things more mad ? They have even gone to the extreme limits of evil and have falsified the Creed in introducing into it the *Filioque*. What is the creeping serpent that has put it into their heart ? They have thereby introduced two Sources into the Trinity. . . . Such are the impieties which these bishops of darkness have spread among the Bulgarians. This news has mortally wounded my soul ; it has smitten me as if I had seen my sons torn to pieces by wild beasts. And so we have condemned these evil-doers by synodal decisions, not in producing new decrees, but by putting again in force apostolic canons or other canons of antiquity. We inform you of it, according to ancient custom, so that you may send us deputies to aid us to pull up these tares."

Then having spoken of the " tyranny of the pope " in the West, as has been related above, he continues :

" The monks Basil, Zosimus and Metrophanes have equally spoken to us of this tyranny. I send you herewith a copy of the letter of the Latins, because the General Synod which is going to be held will send out a decision on this document. You ought besides to regard as œcumenical the Seventh General Council and to add it to the others, for I learn that it is not yet so done among you."[26]

This letter plainly shows the points of contention between the Photian East and Rome. He is hardly claiming for Constantinople a *second* place, hardly equality ; what he claims is *superiority* to Rome. He has certainly not been content to allow the designation " Œcumenical Patriarch " to remain an empty title. And, as the Protestant Kattenbusch says, " He tried to lift New Rome above Old Rome. This Œcumenical Patriarch really thought he could obtain the primacy for Constantinople."[27]

Photius' tenure of power, however, was short. For Michael in his turn was murdered, and Basil the Macedonian, the instigator of the crime, reigned in his stead. Basil evidently thought it politic to do what he could to bring about the peace of the Church, and when Photius had just crowned him he was deposed. Basil lost no time. The new emperor probably thought that the best way of making himself loved by the people was to reinstate Ignatius. Photius was relegated to the monastery of Skepi.

. . . . . .

[26] *Ep.* ii. *P. G.*, cii.
[27] *Realenzyklopädie*, p. 381.

This seems a convenient point at which to turn aside to consider a little more in detail this question of Bulgaria,[28] which forms one of the chief matters of dispute in the episcopal reigns of Photius and Ignatius, and is necessarily closely involved (since it is concerned with the status of the pope as Western Patriarch) in the subject which we are exploring, the Relation of the Eastern Church to Rome.

The distinction between the Bishop of Rome as "Pope" and "Patriarch" is seen in the question of Illyricum. The original inhabitants of Illyricum were Greek. From time to time there was an influx into the country of Goths or Slavs, while in the ninth century came the Bulgars.

The Western patriarchate comprised Italy, Gaul and the Roman prefecture of Illyricum. Until 379 the latter was part of the Western Empire, but in that year Gratian granted it as a gift to his colleague Theodosius. This event marks the point of departure of a serious dispute between the popes and the bishops of Constantinople—it means the beginning of the sharp controversy as to jurisdiction.

As long as Illyricum was comprised in the Western Empire, her bishops were under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome.[29] But when Illyricum was put under the political supremacy of Constantinople, and ecclesiastical Constantinople was now become the head of Greek-speaking Christians, it was inevitable that Constantinople should desire spiritual jurisdiction over its inhabitants—Greek-speaking Christians.

Naturally the emperors with their policy of centralisation favoured the designs of their patriarchs, but they found the popes sturdy upholders of their ancient rights; and to safeguard these Pope Damasus or Siricius, somewhere about the year 380, established an "Apostolic Vicariate" of Thessalonica.[30]

The work of the Apostolic Vicar was to watch over the ecclesiastical affairs of Illyricum and to decide any question that might call for solution, in the stead of and on behalf of the popes, reserving to the pope the gravest cases, or when the parties concerned appealed to the Roman tribunal. Till 484 the Apostolic Vicar carried out these duties, when the then

[28] Art. "Bulgarie," by S. Vailhé, in *D. T. C.*, *t.* ii, 1174, *seq.*; also Art. "Innocent I," by J. P. Kirsch, in *Cath. Encycl.* Pargoire, *Op. cit.*, p. 47. Duchesne, *Churches Separated*, p. 154, *seq.* Art. "Ecclesiastical Illyria."

[29] See *Downside Review*, p. 94 (May 1925), Art. by Dom J. Chapman, "Mgr. Batiffol on the Apostolic See."

[30] cf. Robertson, *Hist. Chr. Ch.*, *ii*, 235.

holder of the office became involved in the Schism of Acacius, and with him most of his suffragans.

The importance of the Vicar Apostolic may be gathered from the fact that at first the popes reserved to him the consecration not only of metropolitans but also of bishops, modifying this rule in the fifth century by granting the metropolitans authority to consecrate their own bishops. The Vicar Apostolic occupied a special place in œcumenical councils and signed the decrees immediately after the patriarchs.

The first encroachment by Byzantium on Illyricum occurred during the reign of Pope Boniface I. Some Illyrian bishops had appealed to the Vicar Apostolic Rufus, and also to the Pope against the transference of Perigrinus from one see (of which, however, he had not taken possession) to another, and, receiving no favourable reply, appealed to Atticus, Patriarch of Constantinople. Theodosius II, influenced by the latter, passed a law (14 July 421) giving the provinces of East Illyricum to the Patriarch of Constantinople, and ordaining that disputes should be decided by the sanction of New Rome. Boniface protested energetically against this violation of the rights of the Apostolic See in Illyricum, and Honorius the Emperor of the West communicated to Theodosius the strictures of the pope, with the result that the law had little effect, and Illyricum continued to be subject to the papacy, for Celestine I in 424 enjoins on certain metropolitans obedience to Rufus the Vicar Apostolic[31] and Sixtus III ignores the law of 421.[32] But the law, though it had been a dead letter, was inserted in the Code of Theodosius in 439.[33]

However, as we said above, in spite of this the relations of Illyricum with Rome function until the Schism of Acacius, 484.

Leo the Great in 444 writes[34] to the metropolitans of Illyricum to enjoin obedience to the Vicar Apostolic, and at the same time administers a certain amount of rebuke to Anastasius for tactless administration. These are only some of the instances which show that the popes continued to exercise their rights. The Acacian Schism brought complications because the Vicar Apostolic was involved in it. Pope Gelasius kept in touch with the bishops of Dardania (see above p. 215), who still were in communion with him. Forty bishops, indignant that the Metropolitan of Thessalonica had entered into communion

[31] *P. L.*, L. 428.
[32] *P. L.*, L. 610.
[33] See Duchesne, *Churches Separated*, Art. "Illyria."
[34] *P. L.*, liv, 614.

with Timothy of Constantinople, sought again communion with Rome (p. 216).

In 519, after the re-union of the two Churches, Eastern and Western, the popes recovered their ancient jurisdiction and privileges over all Illyricum. Pope Agapetus restored to his see Stephen of Larissa, deposed by Epiphanius, Patriarch of Constantinople.[35]

The Emperor Justinian was anxious to dignify the little town of his birth and to make its bishop metropolitan and archbishop. He named it Justiniana Prima ; and its bishop, with the agreement of Pope Vigilius, was to have jurisdiction over a great portion of Illyricum, " holding the place of the Apostolic See of Rome."[36]

Gregory the Great (590–604) wrote twenty-one letters relative to Illyricum. Honorius also (625) ordered Hypatius of Epirus to come to Rome for his case to be gone into. Pope Martin I deposed Paul, Monothelite archbishop of Thessalonica. These are sufficient examples to show that the popes claimed and still continued to claim their ancient rights over Illyricum.

But it is important to notice that in the Councils of Constantinople (681 and 692) the bishops of Illyricum are put down as belonging to the Roman patriarchate. Thus, until the eighth century, Illyricum is looked upon as part of the patriarchate of the West.

Leo the Isaurian, excommunicated by the pope, Gregory II, during the Iconoclastic troubles, retorted by detaching Illyricum from Rome and giving it to Constantinople (see above, p. 295). The popes made energetic protests, but without avail. At the time of the Seventh General Council (787) negotiations were entered upon that these provinces should be restored to the pope, but without success. And with the coming of the Bulgars the struggle entered upon a new phase and complication.

Into this country, then, poured the Bulgars, and in the year 861 their Khan Bogoris, or Boris, wished to embrace Christianity, moved thereto, the record says, by his sister, who, when a prisoner at Constantinople, had learnt and accepted the Christian religion. At the same time a Greek monk, Theodore Tuphara, had been a prisoner of the Bulgarians, and he had taken the opportunity of discussing the claims of Christianity with the prince with whom, on account of his talents, he had been admitted to terms of intimacy. When, on an exchange of prisoners, the monk and the princess returned to their

[35] See Duchesne, *Op. cit.*
[36] Nov. cxxxi, 545.

respective countries, the princess found her native land already influenced by the Faith.[37] This tale is, however, doubtful.[38]

Probably political considerations had something to do with this conversion, but, whatever his motive, he received baptism (865) at the hands of a priest from Constantinople, and saw that his people embraced the new faith too.

Bogoris then requested Photius, now Patriarch of Constantinople, to send an archbishop and bishops for his country. Apparently no bishop was sent, but a letter full of instruction and good advice.[39]

Thereupon Bogoris sent an embassy to the pope and another to Louis King of Germany, with the request for a patriarch. It would seem that he judged that as the emperor of the West was crowned by the pope, and the emperor of the East was crowned by the Patriarch of Constantinople, he also ought to have his own patriarch. And maybe he wanted to be free of Constantinople, and to have for his Church religious autonomy. Pope Nicholas does not send a patriarch, but two bishops, Formosus of Porto and Paul of Populonia (866), and promises later to send an archbishop. He seems to have promised to provide a patriarch, when the evangelisation of the country was sufficiently advanced. But Bogoris wanted a patriarch at once.[40]

Nicholas also sent a long letter of 106 answers to questions on moral and disciplinary matters.

Formosus was held in high esteem by Bogoris, and, indeed, the Khan asked the Pope to make him the archbishop; but Nicholas refused, alleging the canon which forbade the translation of a bishop from one see to another. He recalled Formosus to his diocese in Italy. Formosus had been very successful in his labours among the Bulgarians, and the Latin rite was substituted for the Greek.

Hadrian II, now pope, carried on the policy of his predecessor and delegated Dominic of Trivento and Grimoald of Bonarzo.

Bogoris still urged his request for an archbishop; in preference Formosus. But Hadrian granted neither.

Meanwhile matters were complicated by affairs at Constantinople. Basil was now emperor, and Ignatius was restored to his patriarchal throne, Photius being exiled. But

37 See Ruinaut, *Le Schisme de Photius*, p. 29.

38 See Dvornik, *Les Slaves, Byzance et Rome au IXe siècle*, p. 101, on the real significance of the legend.

39 *P. G.*, cii, 627.

40 Ruinaut, *Op. cit.*, p. 30.

evidently Ignatius was interfering in the affairs of the Bulgarian Church, for in 869 the pope sent a strong remonstrance to him to abstain from doing so. In the same year took place at Constantinople "the Eighth General Council" and after the council was closed there was held a private conference about the Bulgarian Church, at which Basil, Ignatius, the papal legates, and representatives of the three Eastern patriarchates were present, together with the Bulgarian embassy sent by Boris. Michael, the leader of the deputation, asked for a definite ruling as to whether for the future the Bulgarian Church was to be subject to Rome or to Constantinople. The papal legates were powerless to prevent the Greeks getting their way that it should be subject to Constantinople. The Greeks argued that Bulgaria had formerly formed part of the provinces of the empire and that the Bulgars had found there a Greek clergy. But the Latins rightly retorted that Illyricum had long before that formed part of the Western Patriarchate, as indeed it had, long before there was a patriarch of Constantinople; that political considerations ought not to enter into the Greek question, and that the priests could still remain Greek and yet be subject to Rome.

But the representatives of the three patriarchates sided with Basil and Ignatius, and said that it did not belong to deserters from the Greek empire to exercise jurisdiction over the lands of the emperor.

"*Curieuse remarque,*" comments an authority on the dispute, "*de la part de trois sujets d'un calife arabe mais qui prouve mieux que toutes les démonstrations qu'en Orient la politique domine toujours les questions religieuses et que celles-ci ne sont réglées que conformément aux intérêts de celle-là.*"[41]

Mgr. Duchesne[42] speaks of the forbearance of the Roman Church towards Ignatius. "It is very indulgent of her," he says, referring to his canonisation. And certainly when one recalls the sympathy and the efforts of the Pope on his behalf in his persecutions, he is greatly wanting in gratitude. But the Byzantine spirit was too much for him—he consecrated an archbishop for Bulgaria and supported the prince in ejecting the Latin priesthood. There is this to be said for Ignatius: he was certainly in a difficult position, torn in two ways. On the one hand he owed support to Rome, which had done so much for him; on the other there was the emperor com-

[41] *Echos d'Orient*, *t.* xiv, S. Vailhé, *Formation de l'Eglise Bulgare.* Pargoire, p. 299.
[42] *Churches Separated*, Art. "Illyria."

manding obedience, and non-compliance meant exposing not simply himself, but the Church, to fresh persecutions; and after holding out, Ignatius capitulated. The emperor, of course, considered the measure ordered by him to be an infallible means of securing the suzerainty over Bulgaria. The Roman Church considered this act of Ignatius his only fault. That is why she venerates his memory and reckons him among her saints.[43]

On the death of Hadrian II John VIII became pope. He sternly wrote to Bogoris to drive out the Greek priests, threatening, if it were not done, excommunication for the prince, his Church, and the Patriarch Ignatius. To Ignatius himself three letters were addressed, offering either compliance with the papal will or deposition. But when the letters arrived at Constantinople Ignatius was already dead, and Photius restored, reigned in his stead—recognised as lawful patriarch now by John himself (see below p. 342).

In the council which Photius held in S. Sophia in 879, at which three Roman legates were present, he attacked the council of 869, cancelled its decrees, and claimed Bulgaria.

The Acts of this council being sent to Rome, the pope again excommunicated him.[44]

. . . . .

To return from this apparent digression more immediately to Photius himself.

We left him at the point of his first deposition, to consider the origin of one question, that of Illyricum, which had so large an influence on his policy. In tracing out the course of events concerning Bulgaria, we had necessarily to anticipate some events in his history, which now follow for our fuller consideration.

The year 867, which saw the deposition of Photius, saw also the death of his great antagonist, Nicholas I.

In the encyclical letter which Photius had circulated a few months previously (an extract from which is given above p. 332), he set out all the charges he thought it profitable to make against the Latins. Most of them are foolish, but that

[43] cf. Nilles, *Kalendarium*, i, p. 306, *qui a Barda Cæsare multis injuriis affectus in exilium pulsus est; sed a Nicolao Romano Pontifice restitutus.*

[44] Reference has already been made to Photius' famous epistle to the Easterns (*P. G.*, cii, 618) (see p. 332 above) about the Saturday fast, the cheese and eggs, the marriage of clergy, and of course, the *Filioque*—the conclusion they are meant to draw is that freedom from the pope, the heresiarch and prevaricator, is the only remedy. cf. Ruinaut, *Op. cit.* Part of the territory occupied by the Bulgars had not formerly been in the Roman Patriarchate. This added to the complication—there were two autocephalous archbishoprics since the middle of the seventh century in the Patriarchate of Constantinople. See *Echos d' Orient*, p. 154, *t.* xiv.

concerning the *Filioque* was destined to become the *pièce de résistance* of the Eastern objection, and it has done well-worked, though hardly always sincere, duty ever since.[45]

Ignatius returned from exile, and received for his dwelling, until his formal rehabilitation, the palace of Magdala, which formed part of his private domain. The new emperor knew that the restoration of Ignatius would be very gratifying to Rome. He proposed to the pope to renew relations, for of course the Ignatian party was hardly in the minority among the people of Constantinople, though force had been freely used to keep them quiet.

Hadrian II, the new pope, carried on in all outstanding questions the policy of his predecessor, and Ignatius begged for a General Council. This is how he, the lawful Patriarch of Constantinople, expresses himself concerning the see and Bishop of Rome.

> " To heal the wounds and bruises in Man's members, skill has produced numerous doctors . . . . to heal those which are in the members of Christ our Saviour, the Head of the Church Catholic and Apostolic, the King Supreme, the Word Almighty, the Disposer of All, God, Absolute Master of the Universe, has created only one and sole Doctor, Your Fraternal Holiness and Your Paternal Charity, when He said to Peter, the greatest of the Apostles, ' Thou art Peter,' etc. And again, ' I will give to thee,' etc. These blessed words He has not circumscribed and limited, by a special privilege, to the Prince of the Apostles solely ; but he has transmitted them by him to all those who, like him and after him, would become sovereign Pastors and Divine Pontiffs of Old Rome. This is why, since the most ancient times, each occasion that heresy and prevarication have come to light, your predecessors on this throne, that is to say, the Successors of the Prince of the Apostles, and imitators of his zeal for the Christian Faith, have torn up the tares and destroyed the members which were corrupt or incurably affected."[46]

To the Latins this is the Eighth General Council.

The legates who presided at this council were Donatus, Bishop of Ostia, Stephen, Bishop of Nepi, and a deacon, Marinus, afterwards Pope Marinus I ; while Baanes was the

[45] See e.g. vol. iv of Liddon's *Life of Pusey*, p. e. 95, for a very striking passage regarding Eastern opposition to the *Filioque*, and the references given on p. 40 of my *Anglo-Catholicism and Re-Union*, where the question is dealt with, and *Camb. Med. Hist.*, iv, p. 250.

[46] Mansi, xvi, 47.

emperor's commissioner. The council, which lasted five months, had ten sessions. The legates were a little surprised that their credentials were examined, but it was explained to them that it was to prevent a repetition of the trouble caused by their predecessors Rodoald and Zacharias ; and they were satisfied. *The formula of Pope Hormisdas was signed by all the members.*

Photius was summoned, but at first refused. " Since you have never called me to the council, my surprise is that you call me to-day. I shall not betake myself there voluntarily "—which shows that he considered himself patriarch.

When he heard the accusation he made no answer beyond saying, " The Lord hears my voice without my speaking."

Metrophanes, Archbishop of Smyrna, who had held a synod when Ignatius was first banished, to protest against the usurpation of Photius, spoke again against him. There was a good deal of heated discussion by the partisans of Photius, and once more questions of precedents.

Photius was solemnly condemned, all the " Articles " of his case being censured.

It is interesting, considering the place and the special Byzantine failing, that there should have been so strong a condemnation at this council of the intrusion of lay influence in ecclesiastical affairs.

> " As to you, whether you are highly placed, or whether you are simply private people, what would I say to you, if not that it is not permitted you to dispute in ecclesiastical matters. . . . To examine ecclesiastical matters, to sift them, is the business of patriarchs, bishops and priests, who partake in the government of the Church, who possess the power of blessing, of binding or loosing, since they have received the keys of the Church and of heaven, but it is not your affair who have need to be loosened or delivered from your bonds. The laity, whatever the extent of their wisdom and the conviction of their faith, do not cease to be sheep, and the bishop, whatever the mediocrity of his merit and virtues, does not cease to be pastor, so long as he is bishop and preaches the Word of truth."

The Emperor, in review, plainly considered that he had conceded a little too much. He had the title " Emperor " removed from the letter of Hadrian speaking of Louis II. The signing of an act of adherence to the Roman communion (on the documents of the legates) led Basil, jealous of his

Church, to try to get them into his possession. But, protested the legates, " It is not worthy of an emperor to destroy what he has done, since these documents were given with your consent ; if you repent of it, state it openly ; but if you have done well, why allow the taking away of the documents ? "

This Eighth General Council was acknowledged as such by the Easterns, with the exception, of course, of the Photian faction, and its Acts were confirmed by Pope Hadrian II.[47]

Photius in exile was as active as ever. His pen was never idle. He wrote a great number of letters[48] to justify himself, to reassure his partisans, to appeal to the emperor.

Somehow he gained the exercise of the emperor's clemency—whether or not there is any truth in the strange tale given in Nicetas' *Vita Ignatii*[49]—and was allowed to return to Constantinople. He was also helped by Theodore Santabaren, a man of influence with the emperor. It seems that there was a reconciliation between Ignatius and Photius, and when Ignatius died, 877, Photius succeeded him.

Provided that censures and excommunications were removed, there was no objection to his being the patriarch now. His accession would be lawful, and would not have now the character of a usurpation. But Photius knew that he must gain the recognition of Rome ; he also knew how to make concessions to obtain it. He sent Santabaren to Rome for this purpose, and the emperor gave his support by a letter.

John VIII, now pope, was harassed by the Saracens, and in spite of the great differences he had with the emperor over the Bulgarian question, appealed to Basil for aid. A bargain could be struck. The papal legates who came to implore help against the Saracens and to demand the recall of Greek missioners in Bulgaria were promised help on condition of recognising Photius.

The embassy to Rome persuades John VIII that the election of Photius is desired by all the people. The pope is convinced and agrees to it.

> " This concession of the pope has been much discussed. It has been said that it was a deplorable weakness and showed the most hopeless want of character. It is true that Photius

[47] Mansi, xvi, 308, *seq.* : " *Les décisions du concile de 870 ont la plus grande importance. Elles sont l'expression du triomphe de l'Eglise romaine.*" Ruinaut, I, *c.* p. 42. That is true, but our concern is with the seven general councils only—which are to-day recognised by East as well as West.

[48] *P. G.*, cii, 765, *seq.*

[49] Of fabricating a wonderful genealogy for the parvenu emperor, showing his descent from Gregory the Illuminator (Mansi, xvi, 284).

was very far from being the ideal man for such a place. On the other hand, the see of Constantinople now really was vacant, and the Byzantine bishops had the right of choosing whom they liked. The pope was very anxious to get the emperor's help against the Saracens, and it has always been the policy of the Roman see to concede whatever can be conceded without sin for the sake of peace. The emperor in his letter had again protested his obedience to the Holy See."[50]

But a good many writers take a far less sympathetic view of the pacific policy of John VIII. Pope Clement IV, for example, in a letter to the Chapter of Rheims, sees no other origin of the Greek schism than this restoration of Photius by his predecessor, John VIII.[51]

John VIII, however, in his letter to the emperor recognising Photius makes certain stipulations in his desire for the peace of the Church.

(a) For the future laymen are forbidden to be raised to the patriarchal throne.
(b) The patriarchs are required to renounce all jurisdiction over Bulgaria.
(c) Photius is to express contrition in council for his errors.

Photius held the council. The emperor had, through grief, temporarily lost his reason. Death had claimed his eldest son. This gave Photius an opportunity, of which he was not slow to avail himself—revenge on Rome.

The pope's legates came, but they certainly did not act loyally to their mandate. And Photius, too, went back on his word. He denounces the Council of 869, asserts jurisdiction over Bulgaria, and of course is eloquent in his attack on the *Filioque*. The pope's answer is to excommunicate him.

Photius, however, still held his see till the death of Basil. But when the latter's son, Leo, who had been the pupil of Photius, succeeded, he deposed his old tutor. The reason is obscure.[52] The emperor puts his own brother, Stephen, on the patriarchal throne, unity with Rome is restored, Photius is banished. In 891 he died at Bordi in Armenia.

[50] Fortescue, *Orthodox Eastern Church*, p. 163.

[51] Raynaldi, *Ann. Eccles.* a. 1267, p. 57. Dom. Leclercq in his edition of Hefele's Councils, vol. iv, p. 573, *seq.*, gives a valuable comment on this "*Réintégration de Photius.*"

[52] It has been said that Photius had desires of becoming even emperor. Duchesne, *Churches Separated*, p. 146.

CHAPTER XVI

THE VARYING TEACHING OF PHOTIUS ON "PETRINE" PREROGATIVES

PHOTIUS' doctrines vary according to his relations with the see of Rome, e.g. in Ep. I[1] he tells Nicholas that he considers the Roman customs of the Saturday fast, shaving the beard, celibacy, etc., to be *indifferent*; but in his epistle XIII[2] to the Oriental patriarchs, he calls the same customs *intolerable*, while in the synod of 879 he declares that *each Church* ought *to follow its own customs*.[3]

He frequently asserts the authority of the Seven General Councils as an infallible rule.[4] The acceptance of these (he should have seen) involves recognition of the papal primacy;[5] but from the date of his expulsion from the see of Constantinople he vacillates about the Roman primacy.

Before 863 there is no opposition to papal claims, he acts as if he accepted the universal jurisdiction of the pope, and even after his deposition he does things which, in themselves, involve practical subjection to the pope (*Camb. Med. Hist.*, iv., 250). Just as his patron and consecrator, Gregory Asbestas, when deposed by Ignatius, immediately appealed to the pope and invoked the Sardican canons,[6] so, as we have seen above, Photius took care to make his position secure by sending to Rome envoys with rich gifts with the object of obtaining the recognition of the pope; and when the judgment of the pontiff was given, he still wrote that the decision should be altered. When, at the death of Ignatius, he could become lawful patriarch, he did not mind being inconsistent and forgetting what he had

[1] *P. G.* cii, 686.
[2] *P. G.* cii, 721.
[3] Mansi xvii, 489.
[4] Ep. 8, etc. *P. G.* cii, 629, 632. See M. Jugie, *Theologia Dogmatica Christianorum Orientalium ab Ecclesia Catholica Dissidentium*, *t.* i, 110 *seq.*
[5] cf. Dr. Leighton Pullan's Bampton Lectures, *Religion Since the Reformation*, chap. vii, p. 193: "the Roman claim to primacy .... a claim which Œcumenical Councils allowed."
[6] *P. L.* cxix, 1050. *Ep. Nicol ad Photium*, 99.

said and written about Roman pretensions and heresies, but again sought by means of imperial letters and epistles of the Eastern bishops, confirmation from the pope, John VIII. The pope naturally concluded from this that Photius and the Eastern bishops recognised the primacy of the Bishop of Rome.[7]

In that council of 879,[8] after being very effusive to the papal legates, and asking God's blessing on "the protection and care shown to us by our most holy Brother and Fellow-Bishop, our spiritual Father, the most blessed Pope John," he makes every effort to corrupt them. He attacks the Latins and does many things against the primacy, and then in his duplicity writes to the pope and sends the Acts of this synod to him for his confirmation, getting the Emperor Basil to support his request.[9]

It is worth while dealing now at fuller length with the references to Peter and the papacy in the writings of Photius. We may conveniently put our investigations into the form of three questions:

1. Does Photius teach a primacy among the apostles?
2. Does he look upon the Bishop of Rome as the successor of S. Peter?
3. Does he teach that that primacy was handed on to the successors in the see of Rome?

. . . .

1. The position of Peter.

Photius often calls Peter ὁ κορυφαῖος[10] the "first" τῶν μαθητῶν ἡ ἀκρότης[11] and says that to Peter were given "the keys of the gates of heaven."[12] This was written after the break with Rome towards 866.[13] It is apparent from this that he interprets the *locus classicus*, Matt. xvi, 18, as of S. Peter personally, for in one place he says ἔμελλεν ὁ Πέτρος τῆς οἰκουμένης τὴν προστασίαν καταπιστεύεσθαι[14] and in another he speaks of Peter as πέτρα τῆς Ἐκκλησίας.[15] And yet again, he says that "on the confession of Peter the Church was founded," and asserts that the reward for the confession was

[7] Mansi xvi, 479.
[8] See Jugie, *Theologia Dogmatica. Christ. Orient.*, *t.* i, p. 229, *seq.*
[9] Mansi xvii, 362.
[10] *P. G.* cii, 586. *Ep.* I *ad Nicol.*
[11] *P. G.* cii, 794.
[12] *P. G.* cii, 661. *Ep.* 7 *ad Imper.*
[13] In his *Ep. ad. Mich. Bulgariae Principem.*
[14] *P. G.* ci, 607. *Quaest.* 7 *ad Amphil.*
[15] *S. Aristarchis* i, 482. *Homilies of Photius.* And see M. Jugie. Art. in *Bessarione*, vol. xxiii, p. 124, and *Theologia Dogmatica Christ. Orient.*, *t.* i, p. 120, *seq.*

given to Peter ; not to all the apostles.[16] He expressly says that Peter did not lose his privileges by his fall.[17]

ὥστε καὶ τοῦ κορυφαίος εἶναι τῆς ἀποστολικῆς χοροστασίας οὐκ ἐξέπεσε, καὶ πέτρα τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τεθεμελίωται καὶ τῆς οὐρανῶν βασιλείας κλειδοῦχος ὑπὸ τῆς Ἀληθείας ἀνηγορεύεται.

The Orthodox writer M. Aristarchis, who published these Homilies of Photius, is uncomfortable at such a passage so explicitly teaching the primacy of Peter, and is at considerable pains to tone it down. He suggests that Photius put it into his sermon as a compliment to the Roman legates, Rodoald of Porto and Zachariah of Agnani. It does not say much for Photius, if, out of mere compliment, he preached something quite contrary to his belief. Besides, it is pure assumption that the legates were present. And would they have understood the sermon if they had been ? Did they know Greek ?

But this passage of his sermon of Good Friday, 861, in Saint Irene at Constantinople does not stand alone. One is reminded of S. John Chrysostom in the answer he gives to the question why God permitted the prince of the apostles to deny his Master. It was, he affirms, " Because Peter would receive the government of the world. Taught by his own experience, he would show himself full of kindness and indulgence towards penitent sinners."[18] In this same work there occurs this passage :

> Christ was called Son of Man, and was proclaimed by Peter the *coryphæus* of the apostles, Son of the Living God. He confirmed the first title by his own testimony, and the second by approving what Peter said of him. This is why He gave him a reward for having proclaimed the truth. He bestowed upon him the keys of the kingdom, and it is on his confession that the Church has been built.[19]

It might be objected that it is on Peter's confession that the Church is built, not on his person. I have already alluded to this objection when dealing with the writings of Cyril of Alexandria.

But what Photius meant is shown by other passages from writings, e.g. *Πέτρος ἔφ' ᾧ τὰ τῆς Ἐκκλησιάς κεῖται θεμέλια.*[20]

Nevertheless, in other places Photius seems to say just the opposite of most of this—it would appear to depend upon the

[16] *P. G.* ci, 934. *Quaest.* 194 *ad Amphil.*
[17] *Aristarchis* i, 482, i, *c.*
[18] *P. G.* ci, 698. *Ad Amphilocium.*
[19] *P. G.* ci, 933.
[20] *Ep.* xciv *ad Nicephorum. P. G.* cii, 909.

time and the circumstances, whether he is friendly towards Rome or not, and whether Rome is favourable towards him. In his Bibliotheca,[21] for example, a work of his as a young layman, he writes:

> "Even if it ('To thee will I give the keys,' etc.) is said to Peter, nevertheless in the person of the *coryphæus* such a power is given also to the rest of the apostles."

Photius was dealing with a passage of Eulogius of Alexandria in controversy with the Novatians, where he remarks that it was not to John nor to any other of the disciples that the Saviour said, "To thee will I give the keys," but it was to Peter only, who would deny him and expiate his fault by tears of penitence so that he might be more indulgent to penitent sinners.

Plainly the young Photius has misunderstood Eulogius.[22] He has confused the "keys" with "loosing and binding." The latter Eulogius did not reserve to Peter exclusively. But this is noteworthy: In all this contention Peter is *all the time to Photius the coryphæus*.

Enough illustration has been given of the fact that Photius sees in Peter a headship, a "primacy."

2. Does he look upon the Bishop of Rome as the successor of S. Peter? There are certain "Eastern" writers of to-day who deny that Peter was the first Bishop of Rome. Does this contention find support from Photius? I hardly think so. There is an anonymous treatise entitled πρὸς τοὺς λέγοντας ὡς ἡ Ῥώμη πρῶτος θρόνος (to be found in the syntagma of Rhallis and Potlis, vol. 4, Athens, 1854), and by both internal and external evidence it is probably quite rightly attributed by Hergenrother (i, *c.* ii, 663) to Photius. In style and thought it shows marked relationship with another of his works Συναγωγαὶ καὶ ἀποδείξεις..[23] The text of the work has admittedly been altered in places; however, this is how Photius argues against the Roman primacy:

> Εἰ ἡ Ῥώμη ὅτι ἐδέξατο τὸν κορυφαῖον ἐπίσκοπον πρώτη, ἡ Ἀντιόχεια μᾶλλον ἔξει τὸ πρωτεῖον· καὶ γὰρ πρὸ τῆς Ῥώμης ὁ Ἀπόστολος Πέτρος ἐπεσκόπησεν ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ.

On the other hand, Photius frequently, in his voluminous writings, speaks of Rome as ἡ ἀποστολικὴ καθέδρα, ὁ ἀποστολικὸς Θρόνος.[24] Photius has been accused, as we have seen, of falsifying the papal letters, but in the letter of John VIII

[21] *P. G.* civ, 328.

[22] See Jugie, *Theologia Dogmatica*, *t.* i, p. 122. *Bessarione* xxiii, p. 125, *seq.*

[23] See Jugie, *Theologia Dogmatica*, *t.* i, p. 107, etc.

[24] *P. G.* cii, 649. cf. *Ep. ad Mich. Bulg.*

to the emperor, one of the letters concerned, there still remained this passage: "This Apostolic Throne, having received the keys of the kingdom of heaven from the first and great High Priest, Jesus Christ," *διὰ τοῦ κορυφαίου τῶν ἀποστόλων Πέτρου . . , ἔχει ἐξουσίαν καθόλου δεσμεῖν τε καὶ λύειν.*[25]

3. Does he teach that that primacy of Peter was handed on to the pope's successor? Granted that Photius teaches a privilege in Peter, and that Peter was the first Bishop of Rome, does he allow that that privilege was passed on to Peter's successor? The same inconsistencies and contradictions manifest themselves again here. He addresses Nicholas as his "Father,"[26] and in enumerating the bishops taking part in œcumenical councils places first the Roman pontiff.[27] He tacitly, at least, consents to all the usual Roman assertions which are voiced by the legates at the Synod of S. Sophia, 897,[28] and indeed he himself says, "We give thanks to Christ, our Very God, and first and great Pontiff, then to the most holy Pope John, who has withstood every schismatic error and upheld the concord of all the Churches.[29]

When the legates talk about "the œcumenical pope" and that he is "the Head of all the Churches" who has received this power from the Prince of the apostles and tells them what to do, "the Holy Ghost approving"—there is no protest, on the contrary, general acclamation—whoever does not agree is "unworthy of joy and salvation," says the synod.[30]

Silence gives consent, so one must conclude that Photius at that time assented to these claims. In fact he constantly calls the pope his "spiritual father."

But at other times Photius, if he does not indeed deny the primacy of Peter nor his episcopate at Rome, yet urges that Peter was at Antioch before he was at Rome, that the see of Jerusalem has a greater privilege, because Christ died there; and he uses the absurd legend (one which apparently arose during the Acacian schism) that Constantinople had as its first bishop Andrew, who, he urges, was superior to Peter both by age, and earlier calling to the apostleship,[31] and that the rock on which Christ built the Church was not the person of Peter, but his confession.

Photius gives different reasons against the Roman primacy,

[25] Mansi xvii, 400.
[26] *P. G.* cii, 596.
[27] *P. G.* cii, 703. Ep. 9 *ad Zach. Armen.*
[28] Mansi xvii, 396.
[29] Mansi xvii, 425.
[30] Mansi, 480.
[31] See above, note p. 90.

e.g. that the First General Council decreed that no bishop should exercise jurisdiction outside his own diocese; that Constantinople I and Chalcedon decreed that Constantinople ought to have equal privileges with Rome; that in the Fifth General Council Pope Vigilius did not preside; and that when John I was in Constantinople he sat at the left hand of the patriarch.

He attributes the primacy of the Roman bishop to the act of the Emperor Aurelian, who in a dispute (268) between Paul of Samosata and the Catholics at Antioch regarding the possession of a church, ruled that it should belong to the party which was in communion with the Roman bishop.[32]

The validity, value, and sincerity of these objections can be estimated by reference to the chapters of this book where they are all dealt with.

[32] See above p. 52 and Jugie, *Theologia Dogmatica Christ. Orient.*, *t.* i, p. 134.

Bessarione, vols. xxiii and xxiv. Dvorník, *Les Slaves, Byzance et Rome au IXe siècle*, p. 118, *seq.*

CHAPTER XVII

SUMMARY

GENERAL REFLECTIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

It now remains to make a few further comments on certain subjects, which, suggesting themselves from time to time in the course of the examination of events dealt with in the Second and Third Parts of the book, called for further treatment and elucidation.

They are the more conveniently made here. Incorporated in the main body of the exposition, the stream of the evidence, and the development of the theses, would have been unduly interrupted or confused.

. . . . . .

And there are conclusions also to be drawn. The endeavour has been to treat the question of the relation of the Eastern Churches to Rome by the historic method, from a detached point of view, as an "outsider," without prejudice and avoiding controversy as much as possible[1]—though indeed discussion as to whether the view of a question which two sets of people take is the same or different, necessarily carries one a little distance into the field of controversy.

. . . . . .

Not to go over again the ground covered by the First Part and the conclusions already drawn at its close, we may remind ourselves that even if the Founder of Christianity did not found a Church (as certain critics maintain),[2] even if His apostles, and especially Paul (as again other critics assert), misunderstood and thus corrupted His simple primitive teaching, it is a historical fact that, say, in the year 180 (to put it no earlier), there were in all directions Christian communities, all making one

[1] My last desire is to be indefinite. I would wish (to borrow the words of Papini) to produce "a book . . . . without the insipidity of the literature which calls itself scientific only because it lives in perpetual terror of affirmation." Pref., *Story of Christ*, p. xiii.

[2] F. Guignebert *Hist. Anc. du Chr.*, chap. vi, p. 232. "*Jésus n'a pas fondé l'Eglise, il n'a pas voulu la fonder.*"

Church, all looking towards the Church of Rome as somehow their leader and head. "The Church, although scattered throughout all the world," was, as Irenæus says, "yet as dwelling in one house."[3] The evidence from that year onward to the term which we have set ourselves, the year 891, is constant and consistent that Rome claimed, and was acknowledged to have, a primacy. It was shown that the Eastern Churches acknowledged that primacy before the empire became Christian.

The evidence which has been adduced in the Second and Third Parts shows that the Eastern Churches, when the empire was Christian, when emperors were Christian and took a most active part in the affairs of the Church, likewise acknowledged that primacy. The Eastern Church accepted all that that primacy involved and stood for in the minds of the popes themselves.

. . . . .

The whole Church accepted that primacy of Rome. The evidence has established that the Universal Church—"the Undivided Church"—believed that Christ had given Peter a special "something" over and above what He had given to His other apostles, and that that "something" the Church recognised as passed on to him whom she regarded as his successor, and as giving its importance and leadership to the see of Rome.

The Church, it may be advanced, was wrong in doing so. It remains a fact, nevertheless, that the whole Church actually did so.

. . . . .

It is here that the extreme importance of General Councils comes in, for they are common ground to the two parties concerned—they are acknowledged by both East and West as authoritative and infallible—it is agreed by both that they are a supreme channel of expressing the mind of the Church. "*L'Occident nous demande sans cesse nos livres symboliques de l'Orthodoxie,*" says Professor Glubokovsky. "*Nous n'avons pas besoin d'en avoir. La foi des sept premiers conciles nous suffit.*"[4] It is primarily and chiefly on the evidence of General Councils, therefore, that I have relied for demonstrating what the belief of Easterns was with regard to the papacy, and for showing what their relations to the see of Rome were.

[3] Adv. Haer. i, x, 2. cf. Sohm, *Kirchenrecht*, p. 202. *die Koerperschaft die organisierte Gesammtheit der Ecclesia.*

[4] Quoted p. 4, *La Vraie Notion d'Orthodoxie*, by Prof. d'Herbigny. See *Constructive Quarterly*, 1913.

If, then, we take the evidence of Œcumenical Councils, as set out at length above, the records and documents of these assemblies show that the Easterns all along believed and accepted :

(1) The primacy of the Bishop of Rome.
(2) That the Bishop of Rome had that primacy because he was the successor of S. Peter.
(3) That Christ had given the headship of the Church to Peter, i.e. that it was " of Divine Right."
(4) That that headship was passed on, and was, in fact, inherited by his successors in the bishopric of Rome, so that the bishops of Rome held their headship therefore *de jure divino*, by Divine ordinance.

. . . . .

And further

(5) The documents of the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon (to take no others) show that these Eastern councils, by accepting and promulgating the judgment and sentence of Celestine on Nestorius, and the exposition of the Catholic Faith, the Tome, from Leo, acknowledged the power and right of the Roman bishop to declare authoritatively to the Universal Church what the Catholic Faith was.

This right, these two popes (like the rest of the popes of this period) definitely base on their prerogative as successors of S. Peter.

The popes make claims, and they are voiced publicly in General Councils.

In which of the Seven Œcumenical Councils are these claims denied ?[5]

The councils agree, concur, acquiesce in the claims : " Peter, Prince and Head of the Apostles . . . ."[6] " Peter hath spoken by Leo."[7]

The legate at Chalcedon speaks of the instructions which he has received from the pope *caput omnium Ecclesiarum*.

The members of the council do not protest and object. On the contrary, they re-echo the expression in their synodal letter to the pope—

" he had," they declare, " ruled (ἡγεμονεύες) as *a head* the members " (ὡς κεφαλὴ μελῶν).

[5] The claims are not of ecclesiastical origin. Which council confers them ?

[6] Ephesus.

[7] Chalcedon.

And even the fragment of the council asking his acceptance of their abortive twenty-eighth canon twice calls him " the head."[8]

Bishop Gore asks the question : " In becoming separated from the Roman see in 1054 did the Eastern Church abandon anything concerning the authority of Peter as persisting in the Roman Church which had been at any period part of its creed ? "

Only one answer can be given to the Bishop's question. It is " *Yes.*"

For these bishops at Chalcedon—this Œcumenical Council—asserted their belief in the primacy and the supremacy of the pope. *And their descendants have abandoned what they confessed at Chalcedon*[9] *and Ephesus.*

Dr. Gore says, " The East never acknonledged the Roman claims to a divinely-granted supremacy." What, then, do these words of the Eastern bishops at Chalcedon *mean* ?

How is one to explain the fact that 2,500 Eastern bishops signed similar statements when they appended their names to the Formulary of Pope Hormisdas, not to mention the Emperor Justinian and the members of the Eighth General Council, who did the same ?

. . . . .

These Easterns, by these very Councils, showed their belief in the permanent validity of the dictum of the Greek Father Irenæus :

> *Ad hanc enim Ecclesiam propter potentiorem principalitatem necesse est omnem convenire ecclesiam.*

Their presentation of the decrees of these councils to the pope for his acceptance ; the recognition on the part of Easterns of the need of the confirmation and ratification of the definitions by him whom, in doing so, they designate and address as the head of all ; these all were in themselves the comment, the illustration, the justification, of the words of this earlier Eastern bishop.

And all Seven Councils illustrated the constant Eastern conviction—proclaimed and recorded in the Acts at Ephesus.

> " Peter . . . . ever lives in his successors and gives judgment." . . . . .

For even though documents relative to the first two General Councils (Nicæa and Constantinople) are scanty, sufficient exist to prove that the same two convictions are manifest in them. The Second General Council owes its œcumenicity solely

[8] See d'Herbigny, p. 135, *seq. Theologica de Ecclesia* II.
[9] Soloviev, p. 312, *La Russie et l'Eglise Universelle.*

to the later acceptance by the West, and so when the λόγος προφωνητικός of the Sixth General Council,[10] addressed by the Easterns of the seventh century to Constantine Pogonatus (Mansi xi, 657), says of the Second Council, "The great King Theodosius and Damasus resisted him" (*sc.* Macedonius), this evidence manifesting the anxiety to show the concurrence of the Apostolic See is all the more important [especially when one considers the time, the source and the circumstances] in that the statement is not historically correct. For Damasus did not call the Second Council; apparently he had nothing to do with it. While of the first General Council, beyond what has already been set forth above, this is to be remembered: the word ὁμοούσιος the touchstone of orthodoxy at Nicæa, was a *Roman* word. Pope Denys had blamed his namesake of Alexandria for not using it. Alexander of Alexandria was not likely to have suggested it. "The only one likely to propose it and sanction it would be Hosius. The acceptance then of the word by the Council of Nicæa is a sign of the authority of Hosius, and still more of the Church of Rome, of which he was in that the spokesman."[11] For in spite of the assertion made by Eusebius of Cæsarea, one inclines to the account of the Arian Philostorgius and of Athanasius, the most important character at the council, that the wording of the symbol was owing to Hosius.

. . . . .

The councils show that the Easterns did not regard the pope simply as chief of the patriarchs, but as something more than that. The councils show that Easterns believed the Bishop of Rome, as being "Peter," to have the duty of "confirming," "strengthening the brethren."

Mgr. Duchesne[12] has trenchantly dealt with the boast of the modern Eastern Church to be *par excellence*, "the Church of the Seven Œcumenical Councils."

> "Those councils belong to us as much as to them; nay, more than to them. I know well that they were held in the

[10] These Easterns of the seventh century say that popes and emperors together convoked the five œcumenical councils. "Constantine ever Augustus and the famous Sylvester immediately assembled the great and illustrious Synod of Nicæa." "The great king Theodosius and Damasus resisted him (*sc.* Macedonius)." "Celestine and Cyril arose against Nestorius." "The trumpet of Leo, like a mighty roaring lion echoing from Rome," i.e. against Eutyches. "Vigilius agreed with the all-pious Justinian."

[11] Batiffol, *La Paix Constantinienne*, p. 328. cf. Harnack, *History of Dogma*, III, 3, p. 229 and W. R. Carson *Re-Union Essays*, p. 56-7.

[12] *Churches Separated*, p. 45.

East, that the emperors residing or governing in the East procured their assembly. But for the most part they only represent an orthodox Roman victory won over an Eastern heresy ; or, to speak more charitably, a remedy applied by the Latin Church to her Greek sister infected by some doctrinal malady."

And he is right. Arius was an Eastern. Eusebius of Nicomedia, his great sympathiser, was an Eastern. The Council of Nicæa found its chief supporters in the West,[13] and, as we have seen, the term " homousios " was of Roman origin. Macedonius and Apollinaris, condemned at Constantinople, again were Easterns, and the Latin (Spanish) Emperor Theodosius who convoked it, declared that the Faith was the Faith of Peter of Alexandria, the successor of Athanasius and of Damasus, Bishop of Rome.

It is a patriarch of Constantinople who is condemned at Ephesus, and two more Easterns are anathematised at Chalcedon, Eutyches of Constantinople and Dioscorus the Patriarch of great Alexandria. And from the West comes the outstanding document of the Faith of Chalcedon—the Tome of Leo, the charter of the Catholic Faith. Constantinople II is concerned with heretical productions of the East ; and whatever the " tergiversations " of Vigilius, however much his policy is open to criticism, his faith is open to no question. Constantinople III was convened to deal with the Monothelite controversy—and Monothelitism was a heresy whose peculiar field was once again the East. The question of the Icons, the *raison d'être* of the last of the Seven Councils, is a question concerning primarily the East—the scene where the quarrel raged. Duchesne would claim that the Œcumenical Councils belonged to Rome rafher than to the Easterns.

" If there is one place in the world more than another where they can claim the Seven Œcumenical Councils, it is Rome ; . . . . if there is one place more than another where the mention of them can raise gloomy reflections, it ought to be in Constantinople."[14] That seems to me a perfectly fair judgment. He counts up the heretical patriarchs contemporary with and condemned at these councils. There are nineteen in a space of 500 years. That undoubtedly is a very powerful list to set beside the faults of conduct (for such only, with him, I

[13] cf. Chapman, *Art. cit.*, p. 101. " Nicæa was presided over by papal legates ; the popes had stood up for it (*sc.* the Nicene Council) for fifty years, while the Easterns had either rejected or ignored it."

[14] cf. Soloviev, p. xxxi, *seq.*

maintain they were) of Popes Liberius, Vigilius, and Honorius. We may say, then, that it is in the East that the great heresies,[15] the disputes about the Trinity—the Christological disputes, arose ; and in the West the popes arose and intervened as arbitrators and judges. And they were always right ; they were always orthodox. Once again, it is simply stating a historical fact that the councils would never have become " œcumenical " councils but for the acceptance, the confirmation by the pope.

The East and the West had a common underlying Faith. Duchesne questions whether Constantinople I put forth a creed. Well, the creed may possibly have been compiled earlier and then have been adopted by the council. For a time it took the place of the old baptismal creed, but very slowly it got inserted into the Order of the Mass throughout the West, and in the ninth century it was recited in Rome in Greek. In the sixth century, at the baptism of a child in Rome, the acolyte asked, " In what tongue does he confess Our Lord Jesus Christ ? " and according as he was Greek or Latin, so the creed was recited in that language.[16]

The vexed question of the *Filioque*, which Photius was the first to make so much of, and the chief point of his quarrel with the West, laid bare no real difference between Greeks and Latins. But enough has been said of this already. East and West had a common faith.

We see then the authority of the pope always recognised in the Eastern Church, though not always to the same degree. There is the attitude of S. Theodore and the Studites, which wholeheartedly stands for the independence of the Church from State control, and sees in the pope the divinely-appointed guardian of her liberties. And that, indeed, is not so very different from the conviction which lies behind the General Councils.

If Eastern bishops ignored the authority of the pope, it was because they were involved in some heresy, or were terrorised by the Byzantine emperor. Otherwise there was no contesting of the exercise of papal functions.

[15] cf. Luitprand, *Leg. ad Niceph : Haereses omnes a vobis emanarunt, penes vos viguerunt, a nobis, id est occidentalibus hic sunt jugulatae, hic sunt occisae.*

[16] cf. de Corswarem, *La Liturgie Byzantine*, p. 25. " *On lisait, en latin et en grec, les six leçons des Samedis de Quatre-Temps ; pour les prophètes du Samedi Saint et de la veille de la Pentecôte, cet usage se maintint même assez tard dans le moyen-âge. Lors des cérémonies solennelles du baptême, la tradition du symbole des apôtres se faisait dans les deux langues.*" cf. Wilson, *The Gelasian Sacramentary* (Oxford 1894).

When the bishops were free—when the bishops were in œcumenical council—then there was open recognition of Roman authority.

. . . . .

The claim which the bishops of Rome make for themselves—the claim which the councils themselves attest and justify—that they are the divinely-appointed guardians of the common unity of Faith—is evidenced and confessed in the many appeals which are made to the see of Rome by Easterns fighting against heresy or persecuted because of their orthodoxy.

. . . . .

It is, to repeat, primarily on the evidence of General Councils that the weight of the argument has rested. It is from the Acts of the councils that the deductions are chiefly drawn. But not solely. That evidence and those conclusions are substantiated and corroborated by the frequent appeals to Rome made outside the councils.

There are, indeed, letters of councils to the popes, which themselves can legitimately be entered under the head of appeals to the popes, e.g. the Epistles of Ephesus to Celestine, of Chalcedon to Leo, of the Sixth Council to Agatho—and it would be a particularly serious, a peculiarly fatal, thing for those who make their appeal to the authority of General Councils to brush aside as merely exalted and poetic compliments the deliberate, concerted pronouncements of the Fathers of the Church in General Council assembled.

I take it that the Fathers of an œcumenical council—apart from any belief (on their side or on ours) in the supernatural guidance and over-ruling of General Councils—do, in their solemn pronouncements, in an eminent degree, mean what they say, and say what they mean. The "appeals" which are made in or by œcumenical councils cannot therefore be cavalierly pushed aside in the easy manner so common. And so of the appeals of individuals outside the councils, they cannot be treated as non-existent. It is true that Easterns make appeals to other patriarchs in pretty much the same pompous terms as they do to the Western patriarch, but never so perseveringly. As Mgr. Batiffol has recently remarked, "*Je remarque encore que le siège de Rome est le seul auquel on ait persévéramment fait appel, comme si les autres sièges, si glorieux fussent-ils, n'eussent rien qui attirât les appelants ou qui leur assurât une sentence définitive.*"[17] The Easterns are indeed exceedingly prodigal in their squandering of honorific titles.

[17] *The Christian East*, December 1924. *Mgr. Batiffol's Rejoinder.*

The pope is not the only "Bishop of bishops." The Patriarch of Antioch and Melkite patriarch both use the title of themselves among their imposing list of designations.[18] But there are other terms which the Easterns use and can only use of the pope. He alone is "Peter," the "Key-bearer," the "*coryphæus* of the apostles." And it is idle to affect to look upon the appeals and the apostrophes of such great men as Athanasius, John Chrysostom, Maximus, Sophronius, Theodore of the Studium, as mere compliments "in the usual Eastern style," only calculated with a view to favours to come.

. . . . .

The history of these appeals provides the same evidence as the history of the councils. They show, once more, that the pope claimed to have, and was acknowledged to have, over and above his place as first of the patriarchs, a relation, a duty to the whole Church, a special "universal jurisdiction;" and in these appeals we see this prerogative set forth and made use of as the ground of the appeal itself. As "pope" he is concerned with the affairs of the Universal Church where Catholic doctrine and discipline are involved.

And this jurisdiction was never called in question by Easterns, except when the pope felt bound to give a decision not to their taste. A perusal of the appeals of John Chrysostom and Theodore of the Studium is sufficient substantiation of this.

The Bishop of Rome is the head of the Universal Church. He is the judge of last resort, of final appeal. He has the supreme authority in matters of faith—that is why Easterns appeal, and, like Cyril and Flavian, acknowledge they are bound to appeal, when the Faith appears in danger.[19]

The objection that Westerns must not take every honorific title given to the Roman bishop in these appeals as evidence of the Eastern belief in his supremacy might be urged with more force if those appeals stood alone. But they are supported, as I have shown, by testimony from councils. And this is further to be noted: the same appellations, the same titles, the same prerogatives are attributed to the pope in writings not addressed to him,[20] and which in all probability he never saw. Take the following, for example, which is not an appeal to the pope, but occurs in a letter which was written by Maximus the Confessor to a Byzantine friend. It has

[18] See above, p. 249.

[19] cf. Soloviev, *Op. cit.*, p. 71–2.

[20] cf. the letter of Theodore of the Studium to the Emperor, given above, p. 308.

already been referred to above (p. 276). But it is profitably recalled here. Protesting against the heretical Constantinopolitan bishop—Pyrrhus—being designated "most holy," etc., Maximus says he has no right to it so long as he has gone out of the Catholic Church, has been rejected by the apostolic see of Rome, has not returned to nor been received by it.

"The essential is to satisfy and make supplication to the blessed pope of the holy Roman Church, the Apostolic See, which from the Incarnate Word of God, all the holy councils, according to the canons had received supreme authority over all the Churches of the world."

Could anything be more explicit than this?

Père Salaville has drawn attention to the same point in an article[21] in the *Echos d'Orient*, 1910 (p. 171), in which he deals with a letter written by John, Patriarch of Jerusalem (575-593) to the Catholicos of the Georgian monks who had a colony in his see-city. The letter, probably published first in Greek, and an Armenian version of which was in recent times discovered and published (1896) in Etchmiadzin, contains the following independent testimony to Eastern belief in the prerogative and function of the Apostolic See:

> "As for us, that is to say, the Holy Church, we have the word of the Lord, who said to Peter, chief of the apostles, when giving him the primacy of the Faith for the strengthening of the Churches, 'Thou art Peter, etc. . . .'[22] To this same Peter he has given the keys of heaven and earth; it is in following his faith that to this day his disciples and the doctors of the Catholic Church bind and loose; they bind the wicked and loose from their chains those who do penance. Such is, above all, the privilege of those who, on the first most holy and venerable see, are the successors of Peter, sound in the Faith, and according to the Word of the Lord, infallible."[23]

Here is not simple primacy, but primacy connoting "infallibility."

It is but necessary to recall the passages from Chrysostom's and Cyril's voluminous writings in which they exalt the position of Peter, which, as I have shown, means the exaltation of Peter's successor. But imperial laws, imperial decrees, letters

[21] "*Un témoignage oriental en faveur de la Primauté et de l'infaillibilité du Pape au VIe siècle.*"

[22] Peter (in Armenian *Vem*) . . . . this rock (*vem*).

[23] R. P. Hurter, S.J., translates the last sentence into Latin thus: *ejus successores sani in fide, infallibiles secundum dominicam vocem.*

of emperors, comments of Constantinopolitan lawyers, attest unequivocally the same. The Edict of Gratian, the laws of Justinian,[24] the letter of the emperor to the pope after the Sixth General Council—they cannot be brushed aside in the airy manner of those who would treat the appeals as mere "scraps of paper."

All these testify Eastern belief in Rome as the centre of unity. It is not a case of "any port in a storm," but they all confess that union with Rome is necessary because in it is found the certainty of the Faith.

. . . . .

A little may be said of the ordinary relations of East and West when not engaged in controversy. There was plenty of going and coming of Easterns and Westerns. There were always monasteries of the Greek rite in Italy.[25] There are still.[26]

In Sicily, Calabria, the Abruzzi, there were Churches and priests of the Byzantine rite. They are to be found there to-day; and in communion with Rome.

There were Latin Churches and monasteries in Constantinople. But while the Greek Liturgy was never forbidden in Rome, and I believe never has been, the same cannot be said for Constantinople as regards the Latin rite.[27]

It is not so very long since were discovered in Rome in the Forum the remains of an early seventh century church (S. Maria Antiqua) with frescoes depicting the Saviour with Western saints on His right hand and Eastern on His left. Eastern religious art had, as a matter of fact, a marked influence in Rome and one need only mention the marvellous mosaics of the Churches of Ravenna.[28] Churches in Rome were dedicated to Eastern saints. Pope Felix IV (526–530) built one to the honour of S.S. Cosmas and Damian, and adorned it with mosaics, which are still to be seen. The churches of S. Cæsarius, S. George in Velabro, and S. Anastasia are other examples of Byzantine influence.[29]

[24] "*Le magistère de celui-ci* (i.e. the pope) *et son autorité sont choses si reconnues, si consacrées par la tradition, qu'ils ne songent même pas à les contester, quittes à n'en pas tenir compte dans la pratique lorsque leurs intérêts en souffriraient, ou leur caprice, ou leur orgueil*" (Pargoire, *Op. cit.*, p. 44).

[25] See de Corswarem, *La Liturgie Byzantine*, p. 23. Pargoire, *Op. cit.*, p. 310.

[26] See Fortescue, *Uniate Eastern Churches*.

[27] cf. L. Pullan, *Bampton Lectures*, p. 193.

[28] de Corswarem, p. 62.

[29] *ibid*, p. 21–2.

But the influence of the East in Rome is strikingly seen by making even a cursory study of the present Roman Liturgy.[30] A few instances may with advantage be given. Up to the end of the second century the Liturgy was celebrated at Rome in Greek.[31] "It is tempting," remarks Dr. Fortescue, "to look upon our Kyrie Eleison as a surviving fragment from that time,"[32] but he judges that it was not introduced from the East into the Latin Mass till later—about the fifth century. Greek, indeed, was employed, to more or less extent, in worship down to the eighth century. Other Greek words the Western hears in his service on Good Friday: Agios o Theos—ischyros—athanatos—eleison imas—occurring in the Office for that day (nearly all of which, with its moving "Lamentations," comes from the East), they are reminiscent of the days when East and West were visibly one.[33]

To-day, in the Consecration of a Church, when the Latin bishop traces with the point of his crosier diagonally across the church in the ashes spread upon the floor the letters of the Greek and Latin alphabets, he is following, as the *Liber Sacramentorum* of Gregory I shows, a custom of great antiquity.

The solemn Papal Mass, when, in addition to sacred ministers of his own rite, the pope is assisted by deacon and sub-deacon of the Byzantine rite; and when the Epistle and Gospel are sung both in Greek and in Latin, is evidence of the time when Greeks visited Rome and with Latins assisted at the Mass of their acknowledged common Head.[34] Similarly, at Constantinople, up to the time of Pope Hadrian I, the Epistle and Gospel were read in Latin on the principal Feasts. Significant, too, are certain papal vestments and papal insignia as being of Eastern origin—the tiara,[35] the fanon,[36] the "flabelli" carried in

[30] A useful introduction to this interesting subject will be found in a valuable little book lately issued, *La Liturgie Byzantine et l'Union des Eglises* (Avignon, 1926), by Dr. Chevalier de Corswarem, which has as its object to recall to Westerns "*l'influence prépondérante et trop peu connue que la liturgie byzantine exerça pendant quatre siècles au cœur de la ville de Rome*" (p. 10).

[31] See *Cath Encycl.* ix, pp. 792–3. Art. *Mass*, by Dr. A. Fortescue.

[32] Art. "*Kyrie Eleison*," *Cath. Encycl.* viii, p. 715. See above, p. 24, de Corswarem.

[33] de Corswarem p. 9 and pp. 100–103. See also Nilles, *Kalendarium* ii, 242 and 253, *seq.*, and note that the "Adoration of the Cross" of the Latin liturgy to-day was introduced in the seventh century, based upon the Good Friday service of the Church of Jerusalem—the "Worshipping of the True Cross"—described in the *Peregrinatio Sylviae* (see Duchesne, *Origines du culte chrétien*, trans. by McClure, p. 564).

[34] de Corswarem, p. 25.

[35] Anciently called *camelaucum*, see Art. *Tiara*, *Cath. Ency.* xiv, 714, by Joseph Braun, and de Corswarem, p. 28.

[36] Called in eighth century *anagolagium*.

certain papal processions,[37] the use of vestments of red, the Eastern colour of mourning, in funeral rites instead of black[38]

In the East the cultus of the Blessed Virgin is extraordinarily developed, demonstrative, even "florid." "The devotional language sometimes addressed to the Blessed Virgin . . . . is, in fact, more 'free and fearless' in the Greek than in the Latin devotion."[38a]

It must surprise many perusing an Eastern Liturgy for the first time to find what considerable space and important place Easterns devote in their Mass itself to most elaborate venerations of the Theotokos, while the Latin Mass contents itself with three commemorations—two of them almost mere mentions—of the Blessed Virgin.[39]

It is from the East that Rome derives the four special "Marial" feasts.

The Feast of the Purification or the "Hypapante" (ἡ Ὑπαπαντὴ τοῦ Κυρίου), so-called because it commemorates the meeting of the Holy Family with Simeon[40] in the Temple at Jerusalem, comes to Rome from Jerusalem via Constantinople.[41]

The Feast of the Annunciation seems to have arisen towards the end of the fifth century at Ephesus,[42] though it may have originated before the Council which was held there (431). By the time of the seventh century it is celebrated in Rome.[43]

The Eastern Feast of the κοίμησις τῆς πανάγνου καὶ θεομήτορος which, translated to the West, becomes the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin, dates back possibly before the Council of Ephesus.[44] In the pontificate of Sergius I (700) it is found

[37] Derived from the ῥιπίδιον, a fan shape like an angel with six wings, and mounted on a staff, which the Greek deacon waves over the sacred species (originally to keep away flies) during the Liturgy. Fortescue *Orthodox Eastern Church*, p. 409. Janin, *Les Eglises Orientales*, p. 39.

[38] de Corswarem, p. 216.

[38a] Spencer Jones, *England and the Holy See*, p. 200.

[39] For examples, see *ibid.*, p. 201, and de Corswarem, p. 81–83.

[40] de Corswarem, p. 31. Robertson ii, 359. Art. Candlemas, *Cath. Encycl.* iii, 245. Nilles, *Kalendarium* i, 91. Janin, *Les Eglises Orientales*, p. 77.

[41] The *Peregrinatio Sylviae* finds it observed in the Holy City (fourth century) though it had not yet acquired a special name beyond "the 40th day after Epiphany." In 542 Justinian, in thanksgiving for deliverance from pestilence, decrees its observance in Constantinople. It was celebrated at Rome at the end of the seventh century. Its observance spread slowly in the West.

[42] de Corswarem, p. 33. Nilles, *Kalendarium*, i, 126, etc.

[43] Proclus of Constantinople may be making a reference to it in one of the sermons attributed to him. The feast appears in the Gelasian Sacramentary, but Duchesne thinks this a later insertion.

[44] de Corswarem, p. 33. Nilles, *Kalendarium* i, 245, etc. Art., Assumption, *Cath. Encycl.*

to be one of Rome's principal feasts ; and Sergius, it is to be remembered, was of Eastern origin.

In the seventh century, too, the Church of Rome adopted the Feast of the *Nativity of the Blessed Virgin.*[45] The Nestorian controversy had as a result the stressing of the place of Mary in the Economy of Grace. This festival, therefore, possibly of Syrian origin, owed maybe something of its vogue to the influence of the Council of Ephesus.[46]

With regard to other festivals, that of the Epiphany by its name denotes its origin.[47] From the East, too, come those of the Holy Cross,[48] and possibly the Feast of All Saints was indebted to some extent for its development to the East.[49]

In Rome there was an extraordinary popularity for certain Eastern saints,[50] a marked cultus and special veneration ; while, on the other hand, visits to the tombs of the Apostles Peter and Paul by pilgrims from the East were incessant.

. . . . .

Knowledge of Eastern affairs was obtainable, and communion between West and East was also manifested by the institution of papal nuncios or agents, called apocrisiaries,[51] which from Justinian's time (November, 23, 25) appear as a recognised institution resident at Constantinople, though they were there unrecognised some time before. These *apocrisiarii responsales* were accredited to the emperor, not to the patriarch. In fact, the latter showed himself somewhat unsympathetic to them at times. The pope had also a permanent *apocrisiarius* at the court of the Exarch at Ravenna.

The work of the Roman *responsales* at Constantinople was to watch over the interests temporal or spiritual of the Apostolic See as *chargés d'affaires*, and to report to headquarters—Rome. All the Eastern patriarchs had apocrisiaries also in Constantinople, but they had no similar functionaries at Rome.

[45] The Art. " Nativity B.V.M." in *Cath. Encycl.*, by F. Holweck, says : " Since the story of Mary's nativity is known only from apocryphal sources, the Latin Church was slow in accepting this Oriental festival."

[46] Nilles, *Kalendarium* ii, 696, 706.

[47] de Corswarem, p. 30.

[48] *ibid.*, p. 89, *seq.*

[49] *ibid.*, p. 31–2.

[50] e.g. S. Nicholas of Myra ; also the brothers Cosmas and Damian and the virgin martyr Anastasia, who are to-day commemorated in the Roman Mass. " *Les fidèles de l'Occident,*" observes the writer to whom we have referred, regarding the Byzantine Liturgy, " *même en plein vingtième siècle y reconnaissent de nombreux points de contact avec leurs usages latins* " (p. 11). His conclusion must be recorded, " *l'antique liturgie de Byzance nous apparaît comme un glorieux témoin de l'unité de l'Église. Elle prouve l'union primitive de tous les enfants de Christ.*"

[51] Pargoire, p. 63, *Op. cit.*

The apocrisiaries were not legates. When Œcumenical Councils were to be held, or a question of peculiar difficulty arose to be settled, special legates were despatched from Rome for the special work. Julian, Bishop of Cos, accredited by Leo the Great to the court of the Emperor Marcian (450–7) appears to have been the first of these *apocrisiarii*.

The office of apocrisiary, though limited and defined, was of the highest ; and more than one future pope served an apprenticeship at it : Vigilius and Martin, and Gregory the Great while a deacon of the Roman Church.[52]

The extraordinary thing, however, is that these agents rarely, if ever, seem to have mastered the language and to have learnt Greek. We have already seen how Vigilius resided in the city for eight years continuously and never acquired the language. No wonder difficulties arose ; and no wonder the Greeks more than once took advantage of their ignorance.[53] This ignorance of language on either side was a contributory cause to the state of mind that favoured the schismatical temper. Even S. Gregory Thaumaturgus seems to have found " the language of the Romans " " very difficult,"[54] and that genius Photius was ignorant of Latin, though probably it was because, with others, he affected to look on it as a barbarian tongue.[55]

The apocrisiary (there was rarely more than one) resided in the Placidia Palace, and when Popes Vigilius and Constantine came to Constantinople they had their apartments there. It was there in their private chapel that the Latin altar was overturned by the Patriarch Paul in the time of the Monothelite controversy (p. 272). A permanent nunciature from Rome existed at Constantinople till the Iconoclastic troubles, but after 726 apocrisiaries were sent by the popes, but not continuously.

. . . . .

Communion between the different patriarchal Churches was manifested by the custom, prevalent at least from the sixth century, of each new patriarch sending his synodical letters (synodica) after his enthronement to his brother patriarchs. In them they announce their election and make their profession of faith. If the recipients find the letters satisfactory

[52] See Robertson, *Op. cit.*, ii, 368, for Gregory's controversy with the Patriarch Eutychius as to the nature of the resurrection body. Pargoire p. 63.

[53] cf. Duchesne, *Churches Separated*, p. 124.

[54] See Fortescue, *Orthodox Eastern Church*, p. 89, and *P. G.* x, 963.

[55] cf. the letter of Michael the Drunkard, probably penned by Photius.

theysend in return their letters of communion. "To be deprived of the letters of communion of the Roman patriarch would be ground for the most serious suspicion." In the course of this exposition several instances of the despatching of the synodical letters have occurred. But there is one which merits particular notice. Gregory the Great, when appealed to by the monk Anastasius, having examined his case and found him guiltless, tells him that he cannot yet inform the new Patriarch Cyriacus of Constantinople of his decision, since he has not yet received from him his synodical letters (see above, p. 258) and the customs of the Church do not allow him to write to a new patriarch before he has received from him his synodica (Mansi x, 45).

Again, the sign that a schism was healed was the sending and acceptance of synodal letters. We have an instance in the Patriarch Tarasius sending his confession of faith to Pope Hadrian.

Communion was manifested, too, by the inscribing of the names of the patriarchs on the diptychs. And when schism broke out, their names, as we have seen in the case of Felix III, were removed from the diptychs. And we recall the protest of Pope Gelasius against the retaining of the name of Acacius on the diptychs.

The visits of popes to Constantinople, sometimes voluntary, sometimes enforced, not only gave them personally an insight into the mentality of the Eastern Christians, but also maintained the nexus between East and West. As an example of the first we have the case of Agapetus, while on a visit to Constantinople, deposing Anthimus,[56] suspected of Monophysitism, requiring the great theologian-emperor Justinian to sign the Formula of Hormisdas, and consecrating with his own hands Mennas as successor to the deposed patriarch. While Pope Constantine, ordered to come to Constantinople, visits the capital with every pleasant circumstance and every honour ;[57] Vigilius, kidnapped, and kept eight years in the city ; Martin likewise carried off to Constantinople to be persecuted even unto death, are examples of the second.[58]

[56] See above p. 231.

[57] See Art " Constantine Pope " in *Cath. Encycl.* and Robertson, *Op. cit.*, ii., 442. Justinian II is said to have prostrated himself before the pope, and kissed his feet. The pope gave the emperor Holy Communion and returned to Rome with the privileges of his Church confirmed. As regards the prostration see Bréhier *Op. cit.*, p. 59. cf. Duchesne, *Lib. Pontif.* i 389-390.

[58] Hilary, the deacon of the Roman Church, afterwards Pope Hilary, was brought into personal, though unpleasant, contact with the things of the East in the notorious Latrocinium at Ephesus.

Marinus (afterwards pope) was at the Eighth Council (see p. 340).

Blame has often been apportioned to the Bishops of Rome because in dealings with the East they showed lack of regard for Eastern susceptibilities ; or, again, for their clumsiness and tactlessness due to their ignorance of Eastern mentality.

We have spoken about the ignorance of each other's language as a contributory cause of the schism between Easterns and Westerns.

But the ignorance of Latin on the part of the Easterns was more profound than the ignorance of Greek and Greek affairs on the part of the popes.[59]

A list of Eastern popes in the earliest ages of the Church preceding the Council of Nicæa has already been given (p. 69) and it is well to recall what was said at the beginning, that the primitive Christian community at Rome was made up to a great extent of Greeks and Orientals. "*Cette papauté des premiers âges,*" remarked Mgr. Batiffol in a recent publication, "*était bien plus grecque que latine, car Rome était alors plus grecque que latine.*" And a point which needs emphasising and keeping in mind when treating of our particular subject is this : the number of popes who were Easterns.

It is suitable, at this juncture, to continue the list. As Soloviev wrote, "*il ne faut pas oublier qu'il y eut un temps où les Evêques de Rome étaient aussi des Grecs.*"[60]

Zosimus	417	Greek of Mesuras
John IV	640	Dalmatian
Theodore	642	Greek of Levantine Colony at Rome
Agatho	678	Greek Sicilian
John V	685	Syrian. Antioch
Conon	687	Thracian ? Greek.
Sergius I	687	Syrian. Palermo
John VI	701	Greek
John VII	705	Greek. Calabria
Sisinnius	708	Greek
Constantine	708	Syrian
Gregory III	731	Syrian
Zachary	741	Greek. Calabria.[61]

[59] Justinian was the last emperor who spoke Latin as his native language, and he was very proud of the fact. His successors were more facile in Greek. We are told, too, of Justinian's pleasure in being able to use their common language when Agapetus visited him in Constantinople.

[60] *Lettre sur l'Union des Églises*, p. 12.

[61] Gelasius I, 498, was an African.

It was for his countrymen living in Rome that this last translated into Greek *The Dialogues of S. Gregory.*[62]

With the exception of Gregory II almost two centuries have foreign popes. From the middle of the seventh century to the middle of the eighth there are twelve out of nineteen. And when they ascend the papal throne they speedily become (if they were not before) whole-heartedly Roman.

The Greek popes are among the most energetic opponents of the intrusion of imperial power and interference of the emperors in Church affairs.[62a]

. . . . .

Ill-feeling, dislike of or repugnance to or intolerance for the customs of others was shown on the part of the Easterns rather than on that of the Westerns. The canons in Trullo are a case in point.

The Westerns, for instance, were quite content to see the Eastern clergy married men and wearing beards; but they themselves expected, and justly, to be allowed to live as they preferred, without wives and without beards. The Roman patriarch only expected the same freedom in his patriarchate as the Eastern patriarchs rightly expected, and enjoyed, in their respective patriarchates. And so of the other ritual points of which Anthimus VII so unreasonably and illogically complained in his often-unworthy encyclical.

If, for illustration, we look at Nicholas I, the pope whom Anthimus specially singles out for condemnation as "the Bishop of Rome who by his attempt to submit to his power the Church of Constantinople ought to be regarded as the cause of the first signs of the unfortunate dissension of the Churches," can it be said that he was always interfering in the internal administration of other Churches, trying to substitute Latin usages for Eastern ceremonies? His primary duty, as all the popes considered it their primary duty, was the maintenance of the

[62] Robertson, *Hist. Chr. Ch.* II, 398.

[62a] The Greek pope, Zosimus, in a letter to the bishops of the Council of Carthage wrote, "Although the tradition of the Fathers has assigned so great an authority to the Apostolic See that no one should dare to dispute about a judgment given by it . . . . so great is Our authority that no one may reconsider our sentence." Coustant. *Ep. Rom. Pont., c.* 975. See Fortescue, *The Uniate Eastern Churches*, p. 69, and indeed the whole chap., "The Italo-Greeks in the Past."

"The Popes Theodore I (642-649) and John V (685-686) were Levantines of the Eastern colony at Rome. Sergius I (687-701) was 'by nation a Syrian of the land of Antioch, but born of Tiberius at Panormus, in Sicily,' (*Liber Pontificalis* lxxxvi, ed. Duchesne I, p. 371)." Fortescue, *The Uniate Eastern Churches*, p. 56.

integrity of the Catholic Faith, and the discipline of the Universal Church.[63]

The history all through has shown that the Easterns likewise concurred that that duty lay upon the popes.

It was indeed pointed out at the beginning (p. 4) that all the Churches were united in one faith, but with a certain independence of ceremonies and rites, and to some degree of organisation. "In itself this Greek autonomy," rightly remarks Duchesne, "has nothing incompatible with ecclesiastical unity; African autonomy, organised earlier, found it was possible to live with the Holy See. Mutual understanding was all that was necessary."[64]

After all, the Eastern Church was autonomous, and the pope was not always interfering and meddling, as so often is imagined. It was generally when he was solicited to intervene by the Easterns themselves. And though as a rule the Easterns did not contest, until the time of Photius, the pope's right of intervention, that right lay at the back of their mind as his right, to be solicited and utilised in case of necessity.[65]

The fact that the emperors took so many pains to influence or coerce the pope, to get his weight on their side, is an indication of their realisation of the pope's right of interference and of his supremacy in dogmatic and disciplinary disputes. Why otherwise all the anxiety to get his confirmation of e.g. the twenty-eighth canon of Chalcedon, or of the canons of "in Trullo"?

The embarrassment in which Vigilius put Justinian[65a] and the bishops of the Fifth General Council by his "shilly-shallying"

[63] Doubtless, as Dr. Döllinger says, "In the decrees of the Bishops of Rome the distinction between their supreme and patriarchal jurisdiction is not always fully observed; the latter is often supported and exalted by the former; the one influences the other and not infrequently both flow on together; that is, the Bishops of Rome perform many things both as popes and patriarchs; the popes themselves do not always draw the precise line of distinction; they possessed, indeed, both powers as successors of S. Peter, and often appeal, even in acts which were connected immediately with their patriarchal authority, to their supreme pontifical power."—*Hist. of the Church Period*, ii, *c.* v. See also Carson, *Op. cit.* p. 45.

[64] *Churches Separated*, p. 196.

[65] See Chapman, *Art. cit.*, *Downside Review* (May, 1925), p. 91.

cf. Dr. J. M. Neale in his *History of the Holy Eastern Church*, vol. i, p. 15, says that the other patriarchs owned "in the case of Rome an undefined and undefinable something more—a privilege of interference that might not have been brooked from another patriarchal see."

[65a] As Pargoire says, *Op. cit.*, p. 45: "*Ses négociations avec Vigile, qu'il obsède ou violente pendant sept ans pour l'amener à ses vues théologiques, constituent elles-mêmes un témoinage en faveur de cette primauté, comme aussi la distinction qu'il imagine entre la personne des papes et leur Eglise, prétendant rompre avec l'une sans rompre avec l'autre. Cette distinction ridicule. . . .*"

and delays, which while they lasted reduced the efforts of the members to powerlessness and fruitlessness, shows by itself what the Easterns believed about the necessity of the ratification of a pope.

To return : Gregory the Great wrote in 591—

> " Provided that the Faith be the same, the holy Church has nothing to fear from the diversity of customs. *In una fide nil officit sanctae ecclesiae consuetudo diversa* "
>
> (*Greg.* i, *Reg.* i, 41. *Jaffé*, iii).

Hadrian II and John VIII approved of the use of the Byzantine Liturgy and of the Slav language, in the countries which Cyril and Methodius evangelised. But I cannot do better than quote the *Cambridge Mediæval History* here (vol. iv, p. 250) : " It is clear that the differences in the uses quoted by Photius were not the real cause of the schism. From the dogmatic point of view the East and the West participated in the same faith, that of the œcumenical councils. The addition of the *Filioque* to the creed modified in appearance the idea which was formed of the relations between the Persons of the Trinity, but in no respect changed the dogma itself."

Now Cyril (Constantine) had been a pupil of Photius and with his brother Methodius received episcopal consecration at the hands of Pope Hadrian II (868), who by changing the name of Constantine to Cyril " paid homage to the great Patriarch of Alexandria who had formerly been the connecting link between East and West." The year previously they had carried to Rome the body of S. Clement, which they had discovered in Cherson. The pope not only approved of the use of the Slav liturgy as remarked just now, but also of their translation of the scriptures in the Slav tongue. And as regards the use of the *Filioque*, these two Eastern saints, canonised by Rome, did not use the phrase, though in this they were following the then custom of the Roman Church.[66]

[66] The following reply to a correspondent in *Studion*, vol. iii, p. 94 (1926) is instructive. He asks, " *Nous avons quelques prêtres orthodoxes passés à la communion Catholique. Peut-on leur laisser leurs anciennes éditions entre les mains . . . . Ne faudrait-il pas y apporter quelques corrections, et imposer au moins l'addition* et du Fils *au Symbole ? Par cela au moins, ils montreraient qu'ils sont vraiment catholiques.*"

This is the editor's answer :

" *Quant à ce qui regarde le* Filioque, *gardez-vous bien de l'introduire. Ce serait une erreur uniate. Prétendriez-vous être plus catholique que le Pape ? Or, dans les éditions romaines, le* Filioque *ne figure pas ; on ne le récite pas à Rome, même au présence du Pape ! Il suffit de* croire *que l'Esprit Saint procède du Père* par le Fils *ou* et du Fils—*ce sont deux expressions d'un même dogme, l'une orientale, l'autre occidentale—il n'est nullement nécessaire de* le prononcer *dans le Symbole.*"

Whatever opposition or dislike of things Byzantine may have been manifested in later centuries—however arrogant or intolerant may have been the demands and policy of a Leo IX[67] or of an Innocent III—what evidence is there of such intolerance or interference on the part of a pope in Eastern usages during the time we have surveyed ? Very little, if any.

All subsequent popes may not have been so wise as Benedict XIV, who in his decree *Demandatum Caelitus* (1743) addressed to the Melkite Patriarch of Antioch Cyril VI ordained, " concerning rites and customs of the Greek Church in general, we decree in the first place that no one, whatever his rank may be even patriarchal or episcopal, may innovate or introduce anything that diminishes their complete and exact observance."[68]

They may not all have been as prudent as the same pope in his Encyclical *Allatae Sunt* (1755) where, claiming that his predecessors have always been careful to preserve the Eastern rites in their integrity—" it has never been attempted to do any injury to the venerable Eastern rite "—he says that their and his object has been simply the extirpation of errors opposed to the Catholic Faith, and he concludes with these memorable words : " *Exoptans vehementer ut omnes Catholici sint, non ut omnes Latini fiant.*" But this broad-minded outlook is found in this maligned Nicholas I nearly 900 years before.

Writing in 862 to Photius (Ep. xii, *P. L.* cxix, 789), Nicholas

[67] Even Leo IX himself, the object of so much criticism, complaining to Michael Caerularius of his closing of Latin churches at Constantinople, invites his attention to the different attitude to things Byzantine in Rome, where not only are there many monasteries of the Eastern rite, but their inhabitants are encouraged to preserve and practise their ceremonies and usages. *Ecce in hac parte romana Ecclesia quanto discretior, moderatior et clementior vobis est. Nullum eorum adhuc perturbatur vel prohibetur a paterna traditione sive sua consuetudine, quin potius suadetur et admonetur eam observare.* *P. L.* cxliii, 764.

[68] cf. Quenet, *Op. cit.*, p. 162. " *Il craint de perdre sa nationalité, son rite, sa langue. L'Histoire ne lui donne pas tout à fait tort. L'attitude des Latins à l'egard des rites autres que le leur n'a pas toujours été également favorable. Les prétentions du Pape Nicholas III ont, pour une large part, ruiné l'Union de Lyon. Plusieurs fois l'Eglise n'a eu personne à envoyer aux peuples qui demandaient des prêtres catholiques sachant leur langue et comprenant leurs usages. La Serbie, la Bulgaire ont été perdues de cette manière. La Moravie, la Bohème, la Slovaquie, la Pologne auraient eu chance de l'être, si saint Cyrille, saint Méthode et leur disciples ne s'étaient obstinément rattachés au siège de Rome. Depuis longtemps la question des rites est tranchée ; les Eglises unies gardent leur caractère, leurs usages, leur administration ; les Papes interdisent même de faire passer un catholique oriental au rite Latin ; mais beaucoup d'Eglises orientales vivent sur les souvenirs du passé.*"

cf. Fortescue, *The Uniate Eastern Churches*, p. 32, *seq.*, and see p. 157, and C. Karalevsky, *L'Uniatisme*, p. 24.

says that there is no objection to people having different rites, so long as there is nothing in them out of harmony with the sacred canons.

. . . . .

The charge of intolerance, of unwarranted interference comes ill from those who have generally displaced the ancient liturgies of Alexandria and Antioch to substitute in fourteen different languages their own late-derived Byzantine rite, for use in the whole Orthodox Church.[69]

. . . . .

How, then, it may be asked, is the schism to be explained? First it must be said in reply that the schism was not really doctrinal, but political—desired by scheming politicians and statesmen. Reasons religious and theological to justify it were conveniently found for it, all in good time.

Two principal factors in the separation of East and West were the Cæsaro-papism of the Byzantine emperors, and the ambition of the see of Constantinople, now become the capital of the empire, New Rome.

The policy of Photius was but the logical necessary fruition of the seed sown by Eusebius of Nicomedia.

And Cæsaro-papism was born when Constantine interfered so intimately in the internal affairs of the Church.

Enough has been said to justify the charge against the patriarchs of the Imperial City of their share of responsibility for the schism—the ambition of Constantinople in the canons of Constantinople and Chalcedon—the title Œcumenical Patriarch.

But as regards Cæsaro-papism as a cause of the separation, further illustration and support are gained the more the "Erastianism" of the Easterns is examined.

The Byzantine conception of royalty was bound sooner or later to lead to collision with the conception of the papacy. The title Pontifex Maximus might fall into disuse and disappear from coins and monuments, but its essence and spirit remained.

When John Chrysostom, speaking of the duty of a bishop, exclaimed, "If the prince crowned with his diadem wishes to approach unworthy the sacraments, turn him aside, for your dignity is more exalted than his" (Hom. viii on S. Matt.), he was, of course, but appealing to a fundamental principle of Christianity—the separation of the spiritual and civil powers.

As time went on there came a sort of compromise. The Byzantine emperor, considered as holding his office by Divine Right, is looked upon consequently as also holding a quasi-

[69] cf. de Corswarem, *La Liturgie Byzantine*, p. 17.

sacerdotal position. He is the Elect of God. He is anointed with holy oil. And that anointing, it is contended, confers on him a very real function of ruling in some way over souls as well as bodies. Nor is the idea confined to interested classes. The populace holds it, or is led to hold it. Whatever struggles there may be between two candidates for the throne, the one who succeeds is *ipso facto* the Elect of God. "Christianity," writes Professor Diehl, "had bestowed a crowning attribute on him, he was the elect of God, his Vicar on earth, and as was said in Byzantium, a prince equal to the apostles (*isapostolos*) by right of which he was regarded as the supreme head and defender of religion, at once king and priest absolute, and infallible in the spiritual order as he was in temporal matters. And from the combination of these various elements there resulted a despotic and sacred power, whose exercise, at least theoretically, knew no bounds, an authority not only based on political investiture, but also consecrated and adorned with matchless lustre by God and the Church."[70]

"God grant long years to Your Sacred Royalty," they acclaim their emperor. "Long life to the Bulwark of the Trinity."[71] His letters are now θεῖαι σάκραι. And those who approach the sovereign, even his sons, must prostrate themselves before him.

The emperor shares in God's wisdom, is a partaker of God's goodness. His intelligence is a reflection of the Intelligence Divine. He partakes of the power of the Most High; so says Eusebius (*De Laud. Const.* 452). No wonder then that the sovereigns are depicted in the mosaics at Ravenna, their heads encircled with the nimbus.[72]

The unbaptised Constantine prescribes for his troops morning and evening prayers which he has himself composed. He writes sermons and a theological treatise. He fixes the dates of fasts and festivals.

We have already noted how his namesake Copronymus indulged in the same fancies (p. 296). Porphyrogenitus even uses a Petrine text of himself: "God made proof in our regard of His generosity and goodness, when He confided to Us as to Peter, the First of the Apostles, the care of His faithful flock."

[70] *Camb. Med. Hist.*, vol. iv, p. 726, "The Government and Administration of the Byzantine Empire."

Dvornik, *Les Slaves, Byzance et Rome au IXe Siècle*, p. 62.

[71] Constant. Porphyr. i, 2. *De Ceremoniis.*

[72] See Batiffol and Bréhier, *Op. cit.*, p. 23–24 and p. 49–50, *ibid.* The palace of the emperor is θεῖον παλάτιον, his will is θεία κέλευσις. As regards the nimbus, see *ibid.*, pp. 66, 69.

(Incidentally it is worth noticing here that he regards Peter as the chief of the apostles.)

It may be urged that this quasi-sacerdotal character of the Byzantine emperor, this corollary of their conception of divine right, is recognised to some degree, in some sort of way, even by popes. Pope Leo, e.g., writes to Theodosius II, *ut vobis non solum regium, sed etiam sacerdotalem animum inesse gaudeamus.*

To the Emperor Marcian the pope writes of the sacerdotal affection which the emperor manifests to Christians. While to the Emperor Leo these words are addressed: "I exhort you, O Prince, to enter into participation of the glory of apostles and prophets. Disperse and repel ceaselessly those who contemn the name of Christian. By virtue of His sacrament, the Lord has illuminated Your Clemency with His rays. Your duty is to consecrate your power, not only to govern the world, but above all to protect the Church. Your soul of priest and apostle must rouse your indignation at the ills with which the Church of Constantinople groans, ills which cry for vengeance."

But that which Leo here concedes to the emperor—the duty and right of protecting and aiding the Church—is not the same function and power that Leo the Isaurian later on arrogates to himself during the Iconoclastic troubles. When Gregory II wrote reproving him for his interference in the spiritual domain, "Do you not know that I am priest and king?" he retorted. "Doubtless," replied the pontiff, "Constantine, Theodosius, Valentinian, Justinian were kings and priests. They proved it by their works in governing according to religion, in increasing the riches and privileges of the clergy. But you, since the moment that you ascended the throne, have ignored the definitions and the canons of the Fathers; you have despoiled the churches of their ornaments of gold and silver."

Reference has already been made to the astonishing ceremonial and etiquette of the Byzantine emperor. Like the rest of the Easterns he gloried in pompous sonorous titles. The Basileus spent a great deal of his time and thought over his robes and insignia, the constant processions, "the ostentatious and somewhat childish ceremonial of the 'Sacred Palace.'" Official proclamation had it that he "reigned by Christ, that by Christ he triumphed," and that his person "proceeded from God and not from man," and that to these sovereigns, "supreme masters of the Universe," must absolute obedience by all be given.[73] Diehl may well say: "If we

[73] *Camb. Med. Hist.*, iv, p. 728, and Batiffol and Bréhier, *Les survivances*, p. 45.

consider the busy, monotonous and empty existence led by the Byzantine sovereign and the crowd of courtiers who from morning till night, from one year's end to the other, seemed to have no object save in participation in this pompous puppet-show, we wonder indeed whether these people did not run a risk of developing, as was said by Taine, 'idiot minds,' and whether the ruler who submitted to such a life of show was not in danger of losing all capacity and energy."[74]

But it is the ceremonial as regards the Church which concerns us in the present connection. The tonsure which the young Porphyrogenitus received, was not a survival of paganism, but signified some relation to the Church.

The emperor was accustomed to sit in the sanctuary of the church, in a stall raised above that of the clergy. It was in accordance with this custom that Theodosius, when at Milan, entered the sanctuary to make his offering and was going to remain there. S. Ambrose, however, sent an attendant to inform him that that place was only for those who were priests or deacons.[75] It is said that on his return to Constantinople he henceforth took his seat among the laity, and that subsequent emperors in some instances followed his example. But Porphyrogenitus shows that they still took their seat in the sanctuary, at any rate, for the earlier part of the Liturgy. The sixty-ninth canon in Trullo supports this. The monarch also had the right of incensing the icon of the Crucified having thrice genuflected; and there were several similar ceremonies in which he indulged.

The emperor exercises the claim of preaching to the people, having first signed them thrice with the sign of the cross, in front, to right and left.

He makes his communion in different way from the laity. He takes from the hands of the patriarch the Consecrated Host, and descending the altar-steps, signs himself thrice with It and communicates himself.[76] He wears the priestly tiara and vestments, and uses a pastoral staff, though this has been contested. He conducts some sort of service on certain occasions in his private oratory, while the patriarch is celebrating the Liturgy at the altar in the sanctuary.[77]

Demetrius Chomatenus[78] says: "We read, in the *Antiquities*

[74] cf. Cam. Med. Hist. iv., p. 755.
[75] See Hefele v, p. 233 Note.
[76] *De Cerem*, i, 22, *c.* 5.
[77] *ibid.* i, 28, *c.* 2, and Batiffol and Bréhier, p. 53, *seq.*
[78] Quoted by Gasquet, *Op. cit.*, p. 60. But see Euseb. *Vit. Const.* iv, 48 and Bréhier's (*Op. cit.*) remarks thereon, p. 43–44 and p. 46 of the Trisagion at the coronation. cf. also p. 56 *ibid.*, and pp. 71, 72, 73 and pp. 8 and 23.

of Flavius Josephus an inscription thus phrased, 'Tiberius, Claudius, Cæsar, Augustus, Germanicus, Pontifex Maximus, tribune, consul for the second time.' As for our emperor, he is the Christ of the Lord, because of the royal anointing; he is our Christ and our God (ὅδε Χρίστος καὶ θέος ἡμῶν) following the example of his predecessors, he is also our Pontifex Maximus. He has been so and still preserves this title. He rightly also enjoys pontifical privileges."

People accustomed to such things as these, people acquiescing in exaggerated rites such as the quasi-apotheosis and others which have been mentioned, were certain to come sooner or later into conflict with the papacy. This exaltation of the emperor to such fantastic heights was inevitably bound to come to struggles with the conception of the Roman see that its position and privileges were grounded on the Divine appointment of Christ Himself.

The Patriarch of Constantinople, great personage though he was, was after all the emperor's patriarch. Too often he was a mere creature of the emperor's creation. Canons of Œcumenical Councils (e.g. I Constantinople, 6 and 12) provided for the freedom of election to the episcopate. The emperors over-rode them (cf. Socrates vii, 29). The patriarch could not hope to emancipate himself from the thraldom in which his royal master held him. "He lived too near to his royal master to be able to gain any independent authority . . . . and never found the least opportunity of setting up an independent spiritual authority over against the civil government or of founding an *imperium in imperio* like the Bishop of Rome."[79]

"*L'histoire du patriarchat d'Orient est un long martyrologe. Un vice caché rend vaines les splendeurs dont sa dignité l'environne*" is the judgment of an authority on Byzantine policy.[80]

It is the exaggerated or usurped power of the emperor which is responsible for so many heretics sitting on the patriarchal throne of Constantinople—Arians, Nestorians, Eutychians, Iconoclasts.[81]

"By the powers which the Holy Trinity confer on me, I make you Archbishop of Constantinople and Œcumenical Patriarch," said the Emperor, as he handed to the new patriarch his staff.

More than once we see the emperor giving the patriarchate to a member of his own family. It was politic from the em-

[79] Oman, *The Byzantine Empire*, p. 21.
[80] Gasquet, *De l'autorité impériale à Byzance en matière religieuse*, p. 84.
[81] Pargoire, *Op. cit.*, p. 295 etc.

peror's point of view. It ensured agreement with his policy. But there were a few brave patriarchs like Chrysostom who dared to withstand the sovereign and the Court—and the opposition of patriarchs sometimes cost emperors their thrones.

In the quarrels of the emperors with the popes, the patriarchs would do well to side with the former if they did not wish to be dethroned. For agreement with the West could cost them dearly.

Speaking chiefly of the Iconoclastic troubles and the patriarchs' position during them, it has been truly remarked that the schism in the East was fatal to their independence. They would have now, more than ever, to submit to the will of their master without being able to have recourse to the intervention —distant but often efficacious—of the Bishop of Rome. The prelate himself who accomplished the divorce between the two Churches, Photius, by his own action became victim of the despotism of his sovereigns[82]—twice patriarch, twice dethroned, and dying in exile. In breaking the bond which united Constantinople to Rome, he took away from himself and his successors the supreme guarantee of independence which remained to them.[83]

To recapitulate. " He must be either meanly versed in the Primitive Fathers," writes the Anglican Archbishop Bramhall, " or give little credit to them, who will deny the Pope to succeed S. Peter in the Roman bishopric."[84] " At the commencement of the fifth century," says Milman, " the lineal descent of the Pope from S. Peter was an accredited tenet of Christianity."[85]

To these may be added two quotations from a recent book of a Congregationalist scholar, Dr. W. G. Orchard :

[82] cf. Duchesne, *Churches Separated*, p. 146, " Nicholas deposed Photius ; Photius deposed Nicholas—neither sentence having the slightest effect. Twice, it is true, Photius lost his patriarchal see, but each time as a consequence of political changes, and not in virtue of the pontifical decrees. Whilst the Council of 869 ratified his deposition, that of 879 confirmed his re-establishment, the one like the other being presided over by papal legates, neither of whom was disowned at Rome on any important point, By comparing the documents of those two assemblies, it is easily seen that, whereas the sentence of 869 was submitted to with great repugnance by the whole Greek episcopate, that of 879 met with enthusiastic acquiescence. At last Pope John IX decided to forgive and forget all these quarrels, and to recognise impartially all the Greek patriarchs, whether Photians or Ignatians ; while Constantinople agreed to recognise all the popes, whether they had been favourable to Photius or not."

[83] See Gasquet, *Op. cit.*, p. 195. cf. Harnack, *What is Christianity?* p. 250 : (The Roman Church) " upheld the idea of religious and ecclesiastical independence in Western Europe in the face of tendencies towards State omnipotence in the spiritual domain. . . . This we owe in the main to the Roman Church."

[84] Works, vol. ii, p. 373.

[85] Vol. i, 2, p. 106.

"An examination of the circumstances of the great schism, which took place in the eleventh century between the Eastern Church, which had its patriarchal head at Constantinople, and the Western Church, which had its head at Rome, shows that the Eastern Church did then repudiate a supremacy which it had been previously in the habit of conceding to the Roman patriarchate."

And again:

"In the early centuries of the Church, and from *every part* of the Church until the Great Schism, it was allowed that the Bishop of Rome was S. Peter's successor, that the Petrine see was the rock of the whole Church, and that Rome had a supremacy, a responsibility, and a promise attached to it higher than all the other sees, even though they could claim direct apostolic descent."[86]

"Before the end of the third century," says Dean Milman again, "the lineal descent of Rome's bishops from S. Peter was unhesitatingly claimed and obsequiously admitted by the Christian world."[87]

The Easterns knew perfectly well, during all these nine hundred years, what the popes themselves believed about their powers as successors of S. Peter. For certainly the popes were not silent or reticent about them. The Easterns acquiesced.

Photius himself only denied the primacy of Rome when it suited his purpose.[88]

Apparently (if we may accept what Nicholas I says in his two Epistles 86 and 152) Photius thought that if it had not already been moved with the seat of empire to Constantinople it was capable of being moved there. With the primacy there, doubtless he would have been content.

The Eastern Fathers are evidence that the primacy of the Roman see was based, not on its situation in the capital of the world, but on its being the see where Peter presided.

And the Easterns so sing to-day.

No doubt Peter went to Rome because it was the capital of the world. Like a wise general he chose the best strategic

[86] *Foundations of Faith*, vol. iii, p. 39 and p. 40. See Appendix XIII.

[87] *Hist. Early Christianity*, iii, 370. cf. also vol. i, 2, p. 66. "The succession of the Bishop of Rome from S. Peter was now near 200 years after his death an accredited tradition." See also Döllinger, *First Age of the Church*, ii, pp. 149, 156, 158, 160, 161, 164, *seq.* For archæological evidence, Lanciani, *Pagan and Christian Rome*, pp. 122 and 212. Schanz, *Apology* iii, 476. F. H. Chase in *Hastings Dictionary of Bible*, iii, 777. cf. Appendices II, IV, XIV.

[88] Balsamon and the later Greek canonists do not deny the primacy of Rome, but say that as Rome had fallen into heresy the primacy was dead!

position. And had Constantinople been in existence, and had it been "New Rome" and the capital of the empire, it is conceivable, nay, likely, that he would have gone there and made that his see and fixed his primacy there.

But it did not exist, and he did not go there, and he did not make it his see. In 325 it was but a suffragan see of Heraclea in Thrace, and its bishop, Alexander, was content to sit in the Council of Nicæa and to sign its decrees, as such.

It was not till the fateful, sinister figure of Photius arose that the Eastern Church (I do not say individuals) began to deny what in the persons of its bishops it had signed in the Formulary of Hormisdas; what its saints, persecuted or appalled at the onrush of heresy, had confessed in their appeals to the Apostolic See; what its own emperors had enacted in their edicts; what its own Œcumenical Councils had solemnly proclaimed of the see of Rome and of him who held it—it was not till then that it began to empty of all meaning what it continued, and still continues, to witness in its rich liturgical offices.

. . . . .

With his learning, his diplomacy, his cunning, his duplicity, his manipulation of documents, Photius was able to turn his own personal quarrel with the Apostolic See into a national cause.

The opportunity of revenge for wounded personal pride, satisfaction for the thwarting of his insatiable personal ambition, was found when he saw that by accusing the Westerns of heresy he could fan into flame the resentment which all Byzantines felt at the setting up by "barbarian Franks" of an empire in the West—a blow too great to be borne with equanimity by the jealous Byzantines—a project in which the Western Patriarch had taken so prominent a part.[89]

---

[89] See Dvornik, pp. 26, 27, *Les Slaves, Byzance et Rome au IXe Siècle.* R. Janin, *Les Eglises orientales et les Rites orientaux*, p. 124, *seq.*

APPENDIX

APPENDIX

I

"There is nothing in S. Luke's words which bears out what is often said, that S. James presided over the conference at Jerusalem. If he had, it would be strange that his name should never be mentioned separately at the beginning. In the decision speeches at the end, the lead is taken by S. Peter, the foremost of the twelve. Then, again, the words which begin his conclusion, *Wherefore my judgment is*, cannot reasonably be understood as an authoritative pronouncement by himself independently."—F. J. Hort, D.D., *The Christian Ecclesia*, 1897, pp. 79–80. cf. W. R. Carson, *Reunion Essays*, pp. 32-33 (cf. p. 11).

II

"The strength of the case for S. Peter's visit to and martyrdom at Rome lies not only in the absence of any rival tradition, but also in the fact that many streams of evidence converge to this result. We have the evidence of official lists and documents of the Roman Church, which prove the strength of the tradition in later times, and which—at least in some cases—must rest on earlier documents. The notice of the transference of the apostle's body to a new resting place in 258, and the words of Caius, show that the tradition was definite and unquestioned at Rome in the first half of the third century. The fact that Caius is arguing with an Asiatic opponent, the evidence of the (Gnostic) Acts of Peter, the passages quoted from Origen, Clement of Alexandria and Tertullian, show that at the same period the tradition was accepted in the Churches of Asia, of Alexandria and Carthage. The passage of Irenæus carries the evidence backward well within the second century, and is of special importance in coming from one who had visited Rome, whose list of Roman bishops suggested that he had had access to official documents, and who through Polycarp was in contact with the personal knowledge of S. John and his companions."—F. H. Chase (afterwards Bishop of Ely) in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, iii, 777 (cf. p. 21, n. 1).

III

H. M. Gwatkin, *Early Church History*, vol. i, p. 213 (Ed. 1909), " (The Church of Rome) was the centre of Christendom as a whole. Its central position was fully recognised by Irenæus, and became more and more definite as time went on, till the rise of Constantinople. . . . Rome was the natural link of East and West. As a Greek colony in the Latin capital, it was the representative of Western Christianity to the Easterns, and the interpreter of Eastern thought to the Latin West. For all these reasons Rome was the natural centre of discussion. Her orthodoxy was unstained. Whatever heresies, like the Eastern Orontes, might flow to the great city, no heresy ever issued thence. The strangers of every land who found their way to Rome and the tombs of the great apostles were welcomed from S. Peter's Throne with the majestic blessing of a universal father. *The Church of God which sojourneth in Rome* was the immemorial counsellor of all the Churches ; and the voice of counsel slowly passed into that of command " (cf. p. 42, n. 1).

IV

One would indeed have to *search* at this time of day to find any scholar of the first rank confident that Peter was never at Rome. Writing impartially and simply from the standpoint of an archæologist, the evidence of Professor Lanciani is conclusive.

" I write about the monuments of Rome from a strictly archæological point of view, avoiding questions which pertain or are supposed to pertain to religious controversy. For the archæologist the presence and execution of SS. Peter and Paul in Rome are facts established beyond a shadow of a doubt by purely monumental evidence. There was a time when persons belonging to different creeds made it almost a case of conscience to affirm or deny *a priori* those facts according to their acceptance or rejection of the tradition of any particular Church. This state of feeling is a matter of the past, at least for those who have followed the progress of recent discoveries and of critical literature. . . . There is no event of the imperial age and of Imperial Rome which is attested by so many noble structures all of which point to the same conclusion—the presence and execution of the Apostles in the capital of the Empire. Constantine raised the monumental basilicas over their tombs in the Via Cornelia and the Via Ostiensis . . . . the 29th day of June was accepted as the anniversary of Peter's execution. . . . Christians and Pagans alike named their children Peter and Paul, when sculptors, painters, medallists, goldsmiths, workers in glass and enamel, and engravers of precious stones all began to reproduce in Rome the likeness of the second

century and continued to do so till the fall of the Empire. Must we consider them all as labouring under a delusion, or as conspiring in the commission of a gigantic fraud ?

" There is no doubt, for instance, that the likeness of SS. Peter and Paul have been carefully preserved in Rome ever since their lifetime, and they were familiar to everyone, even to school children. These portraits have come down to us by scores. They are painted in the cubiculi of the Catacombs, engraved in gold leaf in the so-called *vetri cemeteriali*, cast in bronze, hammered in silver, or copper, and designed in mosaic, The type never varies. S. Peter's face is full and strong, with short curly hair and beard, while S. Paul appears more wiry and thin, slightly bald, with a long-pointed beard. The antiquity and genuineness of both types cannot be doubted.

" After the peace of Constantine, when Sylvester, Mark, Damasus, Siricius and Symmachus began to fill the city with their churches and memorial buildings, and as the habit of exhibiting in each of them portraits of the founders became general, it is evident that the author of the collection of portraits in S. Paul's, which dates from the fifth century, must have had plenty of authentic originals at his disposal. Next to these portraits in the power of exciting the imagination and appealing to the sentiments of visitors and pilgrims, came the tombs of the Popes."—R. Lanciani, *Pagan and Christian Rome* (London, 1892), pp. 122 and 212. cf. too Schanz *Apology* iii, 476 (Trans). where he quotes the Rationalist Lipsius : " If ever the Prince of the Apostles set foot in the Eternal City he certainly did not go as a simple traveller, but in virtue of his apostolic power ; and his martyrdom, in that case, forms but the glorious ending of his official labour among the Romans. And if, as many Protestants also hold, the episcopate is of divine institution, then the claim of the Roman Church to trace her episcopal succession back to Peter is, after all, not so very absurd " (cf. 69, n. 1).

V

Art. " Irénée " in *D.T.C.*

En résumé, la supériorité que Saint Irénée proclame n'est point due à l'importance civile de Rome ni à l'importance de l'Eglise romaine en tant qu'elle résulte de l'importance de la ville de Rome ; c'est une supériorité de l'Eglise romaine due à un caractère intrinsèque. Ce n'est pas seulement une pré-éminence commune aux Eglises apostoliques en raison de leur origine, qui serait potentior *dans l'Eglise de Rome. Une pré-éminence honorifique qui la rendrait* prima inter pares. *Ce n'est pas même seulement une supériorité de primauté indéterminée, et nous n'avons pas une affirmation seulement implicite de la primauté juridique de*

l'Eglise de Rome. Mais nous avons une affirmation explicite, affirmation qui, parce qu'Irénée traite une question d'ordre doctrinal, porte uniquement sur la primauté juridique envisagée au point de vue doctrinal. . . . Saint Irénée affirme, en termes clairs, une primauté effective. De son texte il est légitime de conclure qu'elle est souveraine et qu'elle réside dans le pape.

Dom J. Chapman, Art., "Le Témoignage de S. Irénée," *Revue Bénédictine*, 1895, p. 57, writes:

"*Substituons aux mots* propter potentiorem principalitatem *la phrase, 'à cause de sa fondation par S. Pierre et S. Paul, il va de soi que toutes les autres Eglises se trouveront d'accord en tant qu'en elles a été conservée par les fidèles de toutes parts la tradition des apôtres.' Tel est, à mon avis, le seul sens qu'on puisse légitimement tirer des paroles ainsi expliquées, et c'est plus logique que la traduction de Harnack. Cela veut dire, ni plus ni moins, que Rome a hérité de la foi et du magistère des princes des apôtres; ce qu'étaient S. Pierre et S. Paul parmi les apôtres, l'Eglise romaine l'est parmi les Eglises; et cette primauté requiert comme une conséquence nécessaire, que les autres Eglises aient la même doctrine. Rome serait donc la gardienne par excellence de la tradition, et la mesure de l'orthodoxie du reste de l'Eglise Catholique.*

De là on peut évidemment inférer l'infaillibilité de l'Eglise romaine et de son évêque, puisque pour Saint Irénée, comme pour Saint Ignace ou pour Saint Cyprien, l'Eglise est dans l'évêque et l'évêque est son Eglise; non seulement son chef, mais son représentant, sa voix."

cf. also the Art. "Irénée" in *D. T. C.* already referred to.

"*Et est plenissima haec ostensio unam et eamdem vivificatricem fidem esse quae in Ecclesia ab Apostolis usque nunc sit conservata et tradita in veritate.*" Is not this equivalent to saying that the pope is the supreme guardian of the true faith?" But cf. W. R. Carson "Reunion Essays," p. 22 (cf. p. 41).

VI

Harnack, it should here be recalled, in his excursus *Catholic and Roman* says that it can be proved that it was in *the Roman Church, which up to about the year* 190 *was closely connected with that of Asia Minor,* that all the elements on which Catholicism is based first assumed a definite form. And the reasons he gives for the primacy of Rome may be condensed thus:

(1) The Roman Church possessed a precisely formulated baptismal confession, and that as early as the year 180 she declared this to be the apostolic rule by which everything is to be measured . . . . it was accordingly admitted that the Roman Church was able to distinguish true from false with special

exactness, and in a footnote Harnack says, " Ignatius already says that the Roman Christians are ἀποδιυλισμένοι ἀπὸ παντὸς ἀλλοτρίου χρώματος (Rom. inscr.). He uses this expression of no others."

(2) The N. T. Canon, with its claim to be accounted Catholic and apostolic and to possess exclusive authority is first traceable in her. The form and arrangement of the canon is hers.

(3) Rome is the first place which we can prove to have constructed a list of bishops reaching back to the apostles (see Irenæus). In other communities they did not exist before the time of Heliogabalus.

(4) The notion of the apostolic succession of the episcopate was first turned to account by the Roman bishop. And again, in a footnote, he observed that this is all the more remarkable, because it was not in that city, but rather in the East that the monarchical episcopate was first consolidated.

(5) Rome, first and very early, dated occurrences according to her bishops.

(6) The Oriental Churches, not altogether wrongly, say that two Bishops of Rome compiled the chief apostolic regulations for the organisation of the Church, and in a footnote he adds : " We must further remember the importance assigned by the tradition of the Eastern and Western Churches to one of the earliest Roman ' bishops,' Clement, as the confidant and secretary of the apostles and as the composer and arranger of their laws."

(7) Tertullian, Hippolytus and Origen oppose the " pretensions " of the Roman bishop, Calixtus ; but in the succeeding decades other communities had followed suit.

(8) The distinction of higher and lower clergy (*clerici majores* and *minores*) first appears in Rome and this " momentous arrangement " gradually spreads thence through Christendom.

(9) The different Churches communicate with one another through the medium of Rome.

For myself, I should read these facts as manifesting the result of Rome's primacy—not as the causes.

The conclusion, however, which Harnack comes to after his discussion of the evidences of early times as to the primacy of Rome is this : " The proposition ' the Roman Church always had the primacy (*ecclesia Romana semper habuit primatum*)' and the statement that ' Catholic ' virtually means ' Roman Catholic ' are gross fictions when devised in honour of the temporary occupant of the Roman see and detached from the significance of the Eternal City in profane history ; but applied to the Church of the imperial capital they contain a truth the denial of which is equivalent to renouncing the attempt to explain the process by which the Church was unified and catholicised." *Hist. of Dogma* ii, 151 (cf. p. 44, n. 1).

VII

There is in existence an Arabic collection of eighty-four so-called *Canons of Nicæa*. The learned Maronite, Abraham Echellensis, published in Paris (1645) a Latin translation of them and the results of the profound research he made regarding them.[1] He came to the conclusion that they must have been collected from several Oriental nations—Syrians, Chaldeans, Maronites, Copts, Jacobites and Nestorians—and that they were translations of ancient Greek originals.

Their genuineness, or rather, spuriousness, does not concern us ; but they are undoubtedly very ancient. It is possible that the Greek version was compiled in the fifth century. And for our purpose they are valuable in that they give once more support to the contentions of this dissertation that the " Roman claims " were acknowledged in the East.

Canon XXXIX.—Of the care and power which a patriarch has over the bishops and archbishops of his patriarchate ; and of the primacy of the Bishop of Rome over all. In this canon the following passage occurs :

> " The patriarch is to all those who are under his power, just as he who holds the seat of Rome is the head and prince of all patriarchs ; inasmuch as he is first, as was Peter, to whom power is given over all Christian princes, and over all their peoples, as he who is the Vicar of Christ our Lord over all peoples and over the whole Christian Church."[2]

Canon XXXVII of Echellensis Nova Versio lxxxiv. Arabic. *Canonum Conc. Nicæni*, runs as follows :

> " Let there be only four patriarchs in the whole world as there are four writers of the Gospel . . . . And let there be a prince and chief over them, the lord of the see of the Divine Peter at Rome, according as the Apostles commanded. And after him the lord of the great Alexandria, which is the see of Mark. And the third is the lord of Ephesus, which is the see of John the Divine, who speaks divine things. And the fourth and last is my lord of Antioch, which is another see of Peter[3] (cf. p. 85, n. 2).

VIII

The attitude of Rome and the West is most justly described by the writer we have already quoted, who sympathises whole-

[1] See Hefele i, p. 361, *seq.*, where he deals with the number of the Canons of Nicæa. cf. *Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers*, excursus, p. 43, *seq.*, vol. xiv.

[2] See *Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers*, p. 48, vol. xiv (The Seven Œcumenical Councils). This is the canon as given by Turrianus.

[3] *ibid.*, p. 48.

heartedly with Meletius, but who is the best authority on the Meletian Question and the Schism of Antioch. *" La communion primitive avec la communauté eustathienne n'est jamais rompue, mais elle n'implique pas la reconnaissance officielle de Paulin comme évêque. On ne trouve pas trace de cette reconnaissance avant les lettres au sujet de Vital en* 375. *Cela seul explique l'affirmation expresse de Basile en ce moment, ses plaintes sur la versatilité des Occidentaux quand il s'agit de communion et la neutralité d'Evagrios à son retour de Rome en* 374. *Si le pape s'était déjà prononcé à ce moment-là pour Paulin, Evagrios n'aurait pu promettre à S. Basile de participer à la synaxe de Dorothée, diacre mélécien. La joie des Pauliniens et l'ennui de leurs adversaires lors des lettres pour Vital n'ont pas d'autre signification. Cet acte d'ailleurs est isolé. Jusqu'à la mort de Mélèce on n'a pas d'autre document positif et il ne semble avoir eu aucune répercussion sur les affaires d'Antioche. Damase, après avoir institué Paulin son intermédiaire pour recevoir ceux qui veulent s'unir à lui, continue après comme avant cette lettre, à communiquer directement avec les Orientaux dont Mélèce est le chef.*

" Mélèce lui, d'après S. Basile, est reconnu comme évêque des 366 *par le pape Libère dans une lettre que rapporte Sylvain de Tarse. Sous Damase l'état des églises d'Orient provoque une série de légations dont l'agent principal est toujours un diacre ou un prêtre de Mélèce. S. Basile contribue plus que personne à leur envoi, mais c'est toujours Mélèce qui apparaît comme le chef ; il décide sur l'opportunité, compose ou signe le premier les lettres communes. Les communications ne sont jamais rompues et Damase répond en traitant de frères les Orientaux et en s'excusant sur son impuissance actuelle à les secourir. D'abord contents (legation de Sabinus), puis froissés du peu de zèle que les Occidentaux semblent mettre à les secourir et que l'on attribue à de l'arrogance, puis de la lettre sur Vital, qui fait accuser l'Occident d'ignorer la vraie situation des partis, les Orientaux ne se découragent point ; une double legation (Dorithée-Sanctissime) rapporte des lettres et des assurances chaleureuses ; l'union est parfaite et explicite. Ces laborieuses négociations aboutissent à la signature par Mélèce et* 151 *évêques orientaux des pièces raportées d'Occident ; le tout est renvoyé à Damase comme attestation de la foi orthodoxe des Orientaux et de leur communion avec Rome. Mais, comme la question du schisme réclame toujours une solution, Damase et les Occidentaux proposent aux deux évêques qu'ils savent également orthodoxes, l'entente cordiale, ou, si elle ne peut se faire, l'attribution exclusive de l'épiscopat à celui des deux qui survivrait. On ne fait donc plus aucune différence entre Paulin et Mélèce.*

Par suite il est inexact d'affirmer, comme on le fait ordinairement, que Mélèce fut repoussé jusqu'à sa mort par Rome et les Occidentaux et que, dès le début, l'épiscopat de Paulin fut reconnu

par eux sans conteste." F. Cavallera, *Le Schisme d'Antioche*, pp. 229–231 (cf. pp. 119 *seq.*).

IX

An interesting example of the recognition on the part of the East of the primacy of Peter is afforded by John of Thessalonica.[1]

Writing on *La Vie et les Œuvres de Jean de Thessalonique*, M. Jugie has drawn attention to the testimony that this Eastern writer bears.

The value in this respect of the quaint work, *Discourse on the Dormition of the Holy Virgin*,[2] on which M. Jugie comments, arises from the fact that it gives incidentally the belief of the Thessalonians of that time, in the jurisdiction and primacy of Peter over the other apostles.

It certainly is not a mere primacy of honour in which the author of this extraordinary production believes. The legend goes that S. John the Apostle is transported miraculously from Sardis to Jerusalem to the house of the Virgin. The latter says to him, " John, my child, take this palm. You will bear it before my funeral bier." John replies, " I cannot take it in the absence of my fellow-apostles, lest on their arrival there arise among us murmurs and complaints, for there is one among them who is greater than I and who has been placed over us." Then Peter arrives, and then Paul (recently added to the Apostolic College) and the other apostles, each borne on a cloud. After greetings and expressions of surprise at so unexpected a mode of meeting together, Peter asks Paul to pray to know the Divine will. " Brother Paul, arise and pray before me, for I have experienced ineffable joy at your conversion to the faith of Christ." Paul replies : " Excuse me, Father Peter, I am only a neophyte unworthy to tread in your footsteps. How can I offer prayer before you ? You are indeed the column of the Light and all the brethren who surround me here are better than I. Thou, therefore, Father, pray for us all that the grace of the Lord may remain with us." The apostles rejoice at the humility of Paul and say, " Father Peter, thou hast been set over us, pray then once more before us."

Peter protests himself the least and servant of all, but grants their request, and later is urged by the apostles to address the people gathered round the house of the Virgin. " Who is wiser than thou ? Joyfully we will listen to the words of thy wisdom and knowledge."

The funeral takes place, and Peter carries the palm—it had been given to Mary by the angel Gabriel when announcing her

[1] It is to be remembered, however, that Thessalonica was in the Western Patriarchate. John was bishop between 610 and 649.

[2] *Echos d'Orient*, No.127.

[3] He notes among other MSS. *Bodleian Codex Cromwell* ii, fol. 249–271, thirteenth century.

approaching death. Peter says to John: "Thou art a virgin, and thou oughtest to place thyself at the head of the coffin when we go to carry it to its place." But John at once replies: "Thou art our Father and our Bishop, it is thou who oughtest to march at our head carrying the palm and intoning the hymn."

Peter makes a compromise, moved by humility and love. "So that no one of us may feel hurt, let the palm serve as a crown to the coffin." And he intones "When Israel came out of Egypt, Alleluia!" (cf. p. 334).

X

The following passage alone, a summary of the relations of the Roman See to the Eastern Churches during the fourth century, shows once more the baselessness of the assertion of the disciples of Dr. Gore that Leo I was the founder of the Papal School.

Pope Boniface I (422), writing to the bishops of Thessaly, tells them that the case of the Universal Church was laid by the Lord's decree upon the Apostle Peter:

> "Nor can his honour ever be free from anxieties since it is certain that the supreme authority (*summum rerum*) depends on his deliberation."

This care, Boniface claims, has been exercised by the Bishops of Rome who succeeded to that charge:

> "Which things carry my mind even to the regions of the East, which by the force of our solicitude we in a manner behold . . . . We must be able to prove by instances that *the greatest Eastern Churches* in important matters which required greater discussions have always consulted the Roman see, and as often as need arose asked its help. Athanasius and Peter, of holy memory, Bishops of the Church of Alexandria, asked the help of this see. When the Church of Antioch had been in trouble a long time, so that there was continual passing to and fro for this, first under Meletius, afterwards under Flavian, it is notorious that the Apostolic See was consulted. By whose authority, after many things done by our Church, everyone knows that Flavian received the grace of communion, which he would have forfeited forever, had not writings gone from hence respecting it. The Emperor Theodosius, of merciful memory, considering the ordination of Nestorius to want ratification, because it was not according to our rule,[1] sent an embassy of councillors and bishops, and solicited a letter of communion to be regularly despatched to him from the Roman See *to confirm his episcopate*. A short time since, that is, under my

[1] He was a layman.

predecessor Innocent, of blessed memory, the pontiffs of the Eastern Churches, grieving at their severance from the communion of blessed Peter, asked through their legates for reconciliation, as your Charity remembers."[1] (cf. p. 169).

XI

" *L'Orient et l'Occident furent deux régions fermées l'une à l'autre. La différence de langue avait élevé entre elles une barrière très difficile à franchir. A l'origine, l'Eglise romaine parlait grec ; ainsi* l'épître *de Clément, le* pasteur *d'Hermas, le dialogue antimontaniste de Caïus, toute la littérature d'Hippolyte. Le latin ne se manifeste pas avant l'extrême déclin du IIIe siècle, depuis le canon de Muratori et les homélies attribuées à Victor, si réellement elles sont de lui. La correspondance avec les églises de langue grecque se faisait en cette langue ;* les epitaphes des Papes jusqu'à la fin du IIIe siècle sont rédigées en grec. *Au IVe siècle et depuis, il en est tout autrement : le latin domine ; il est seul employé dans l'épigraphie, dans la littérature, dans la liturgie, dans la correspondance.* De leur côté, les grecs n'ont jamais fait, on le sait, de grands efforts pour parler le latin. *Sacrée ou profane la littérature latine leur est toujours demeurée close. Ils n'ont cessé de professer pour elle une considération analogue à celle qu'ils accordent présentement aux Ecritures bulgares.*"—Duchesne, *La Quinzaine*, March 15, 1896.

" *Un Grec parlant le latin devint une grande rareté. Photius qui savait tant de choses ne savait pas le latin. En dehors de la chancellerie, ce fut toute une affaire que de traduire une lettre écrite en latin.*"—Duchesne, *ibid* (cf. p. 160).

XII

Photius has justification when he complains of the Latins conferring confirmation on the Bulgarians, who already at their baptism according to the Greek usage had received the anointing. The popes were not always well served by wise and tactful representatives. cf. Dom Chardon, O.S.B., *Histoire des Sacrements*, when dealing with confirmation :

" *On peut voir, dit M. Renaudot, par les deux dissertations de Holstenius sur la Confirmation imprimées à Rome par les soins du Cardinal François Barberin, alors préfet de la Congrégation du* Propaganda Fide, *et qui était de toutes les autres Congrégations, qu'on ne croyait pas à Rome que la confirmation des Grecs fut nulle et abusive, puisque ces dissertations furent faites pour empêcher divers changements proposés par des missionnaires peu savants et fort scrupuleux pour établir en Orient jusqu'aux moindres cérémonies qui sont présentement en*

[1] *Ep.* xv, 6, *ad Rufum et alios epis.* See Cavallera *Thesaurus. Doctr. Cath.*, p. 193.

usage parmi nous, et encore plus hardis pour condamner celles de l'ancienne Eglise qu'ils ne connaissaient point. Arcadius et Allatius ont justifié les Grecs suffisamment. M. Habert, le P. Sirmond, le P. Morin, et tous les plus grands hommes du dernier siècle ont été dans les mêmes sentiments. Ce sont eux qu'il faut suivre et non pas des ignorants desquels Holstenius a dit avec beaucoup de raison, qu'on devait leur imputer le schisme déplorable qui a divisé si longtemps les Eglises d'Orient et d'Occident, à ceux principalement qui, oubliant la charité chrétienne, veulent, par une démangeaison de disputer, mettre en question toutes les choses qui *se font suivant un rite différent, parmi les autres. Tels étaient ceux qui, dans la Bulgarie, donnaient la Confirmation à ceux qui l'avaient reçue avec le Baptême par les prêtres grecs. Ce fut une des plaintes que fit Photius contre les Latins, ajoute M. Renandot, dans sa lettre circulaire aux patriarches d'Orient, et elle était fondée en raison, comme la remarque Holstenius. C'est ce que font encore présentement ceux qui croient que la moindre diversité dans les rites renverse la religion"* (cf. p. 332).

XIII

W. E. Orchard, D.D., *Foundations of the Faith* iii, *Ecclesiological*, p. 38 : "Therefore we are compelled to turn back and re-examine the Roman claims, and see if they are any more satisfactory. They are founded first of all upon the fact of unbroken historical descent ; the Roman Church is directly descended from the primitive Church ; no one disputes that. But so are other bodies which claim to be Churches, notably the Orthodox Church ; and even the lesser Eastern Churches, divided not only from the Roman, but from the Orthodox Church, and in heresy, can nevertheless claim direct descent from the primitive Church as well as preserving the apostolic order and succession. But Rome also claims that all other Churches, whether heretical bodies, the Eastern Orthodox, the Anglicans and other Reformation Churches, have broken away from her. It must be confessed that this is historically true. Moreover, an examination of the circumstances of the Great Schism, which took place in the eleventh century between the Eastern Church, which had its patriarchal head at Constantinople, and the Western Church, which had its head at Rome, shews that the Eastern Church did then repudiate a supremacy which it had been previously in the habit of conceding to the Roman Patriarchate. It takes two parties to make a quarrel, and even when a schism occurs, the responsibility for the schism need not rest wholly upon the body that actually tears itself away. But although Rome was not blameless, the actual as well as the formal responsibility does seem to rest the more heavily upon the Eastern Church." See also p. 46, *seq* (cf. p. 377).

XIV

The Christian East, vol. vii, No. 4, December 1926 (C. T. Bridgeman), p. 163, has an interesting account of "Syrian Orthodox Consecrations" at the hands of the Syrian (Jacobite) Patriarch of Antioch, October 24, 1926, in which the following striking paragraph occurs:

> "It is interesting that at this service the Patriarch, in his Arabic sermon, and Bishop Michael of Cottayam, in the one following in English, took as their texts the authority that the Patriarchs of Antioch received from S. Peter. *They claimed for S. Peter that he was the Rock, apart from which there could be no Church, and said he was Christ's Vicar, etc., making every distinctive Roman claim for the Patriarch of Antioch* (Syrian, of course) *except infallibility*. It was most curious. However, the reason was doubtless that there had been so much denial of the Patriarch's authority in India that he took the opportunity to lay down the law" (cf. p. 377).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aimé, Puech—S. Jean Chrysostome. Paris, 1923.

Allard, P.—Le Christianisme et l'Empire Romain. Paris, 1908.

Analecta Bollandiana—S. Théodore Studite by P. Peeters and Van der Vorst.

Bardenhewer—Geschichte der Altkirchlichen Litteratur.

Bardenhewer-Shahan—Patrology. Freiburg, 1908.

Bardy, Gustave—S. Athanase. Paris, 1914.

Batiffol—Article, " Anglo-Catholics and Roman Catholics," in Blackfriars. June, 1923.

L'Eglise Naissante. Paris, 1922.

La Paix Constantinienne. Paris, 1914.

Batiffol et Bréhier—Les survivances du culte Impérial romain. Paris, 1920.

Baynes, N. H.—The Byzantine Empire. 1925.

Benni, Abp.—The Tradition of the Syrian Church of Antioch. London, 1871.

Bessarione—Vols. xxxv and xxxvi. Rome.

Bethune-Baker—Nestorius and his teaching. Cambridge, 1908.

Bréhier, L.—La Querelle des Images. Paris, 1904.

Le Schisme Oriental.

Bright, W.—Age of the Fathers. London, 1903.

The Roman See in the Early Church. London, 1896.

Burkitt—Early Eastern Christianity. 1904.

Burton, Dr.—The Apostolic Fathers. London, N.D.

Bury, J. B.—History of the Eastern Roman Empire. London, 1922.

History of the Later Roman Empire, 2 vols. 1889.

Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, by Edward Gibbon. Edited by J. B. Bury. London, 1908.

Calvet, J.—L'Union des Eglises. Paris, 1921.

Cambridge Conferences—" The Papacy," by various writers. Cambridge, 1923.

Cambridge Mediæval History—Vol. iv. 1923.
Catholic Encyclopædia—Various Articles, e.g. Clement, Justinian, etc.
Cavallera, F.—Thesaurus Doctrinae Catholicae. Paris, 1920.
Le Schisme d'Antioche. Paris, 1905.
Chapman, J.—Bp. Gore and the Catholic Claims. 1905.
Art., "Mgr. Battifol on the Apostolic See," Downside Review. 1925.
Revue Bénédictine, 1895, xii, "Le témoignage de S. Irénée en faveur de l'église romaine"; *ibid.* 1896, xiii, S. Ignace d'Antioche. Dublin Review, 1903. "S. Chrysostom on S. Peter"; *ibid.*, "S. Athanasius and Pope Julius I"; *ibid.*, 1906, "The Condemnation of Pope Honorius," "The First Eight General Councils and Papal Infallibility."
Chéramy—S. Sébastien hors les Murs. Paris, 1925.
Christian East, The—1922–1925.
Corswarem, C. de—La Liturgie Byzantine. Avignon, 1926.

D'Herbigny—Theologica de Ecclesia, Tome II. Paris, 1921.
Vladimir Soloviev. Un Newman Russe. Paris, 1911.
La vraie notion d'Orthodoxie—Roma.
Dictionnaire de Theologie Catholique—Art., "Jean Chrysostome," "Athanase," etc.
Diehl*—Figures Byzantines.
Byzance, Grandeur et Décadence. Paris, 1926.
Driver & Hodgson—English Translation of Nestorius, "The Bazaar of Heraclides." 1926.
Duchesne—The Churches Separated from Rome. London, 1907.
Liber Pontificalis. Paris, 1904.
Dufourcq, A.—Saint Irénée. Paris, 1904.
Dvorník—Les Slaves, Byzance et Rome au IX siècle. Paris, 1926.

Echos d'Orient, 1897.—
Edmundson, G.—The Church in Rome in the First Century. London, 1913.
Emereau, Casimir—Saint Ephrem le Syrien. Paris, N.D.
Ermoni, V.—Saint Jean Damascène. Paris, 1904.
Eusebius—Ecclesiastical History in "Nicene and Ante-Nicene Fathers."
Historia Ecclesiae.
Vita Constantini.

*Theodore Impératrice de Byzance, Paris. L'Empire Byzantin.

FINLAY, P.—The Church of Christ. London, 1918.
FORTESCUE—The Orthodox Eastern Church. London, 1907.
The Lesser Eastern Churches. London, 1913.
The Uniate Eastern Churches. London, 1923.
The Greek Fathers. London, 1908.
FREMONT, G.—Les Principes, Tome VIII. Paris.
FUNK, F. X.—Manual of Church History, 2 vols. London, 1910.

GARDINER, ALICE—S. Theodore of Studium. London, 1905.
GASQUET, AM.—De l'autorité impériale en matière religieuse à Byzance. Paris, 1879.
GASQUET, J. R.—Studies. London, 1904.
GÉNIER—Vie de S. Euthyme le Grand. Paris, 1909.
GIBBON, EDWARD—Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire. London, 1898. Ed. Bury.
GORE, BP.—The Holy Spirit in the Church. 1924.
Catholicism and Roman Catholicism. 1923.
Roman Catholic Claims. 1905.

HARNACK—History of Dogma. London (trans.).
HARRAPIN—Primatus Pontificis Romani in Concilio Chalcedonensi et Ecclesiae Dissidentes. Ad Claras Aquas, 1923.
HEFELE—History of the Councils. Ed. Clark. Vols. i–v (Eng. Trans.).
HEFELE-LECLERCQ—Histoire des Conciles, Vols. i–viii.
HERGENRÖTHER—Photius, 3 vols. Regensburg. Manz, 1867.
HORE, C. H.—Eighteen Centuries of the Orthodox Greek Church.

JANIN, RAYMOND—Les Eglises orientales et les Rites orientaux. Paris. N.D.
JOURNAL OF THEOLOGICAL STUDIES. 1902. Art. by C. H. Turner, "The Genuineness of the Sardican Canons." 1900—Vol. I; 1913—Vol. xiv.
JUGIE, M.—"Nestorius et la controverse Nestorienne." Paris, 1912.
Le Culte de Photius. Paris, 1923.
Theologia Dogmatica Christianorum Orientalium ab Ecclesia Catholica Dissidentium. Tome I. Paris, 1926.

KIDD, B. J.—History of the Church. Oxford, 1922.
KOROLEVSKY, CYRILLE—Les Grecs Melkites in "Echos d'Orient."

LABOURT, J.—Le Christianisme dans l'empire Perse. Paris, 1904.
De Timotheo I Nestorianorum Patriarcha. Paris, 1904.
LAGRANGE, M. J.—Mélanges d'Histoire Religieuse. Paris, 1915.
LANCIANI, R.—Pagan and Christian Rome. London, 1892.
LEBON, J.—Le Monophysisme Sévérien. Louvain, 1907.
LIGHTFOOT, BP.—Apostolic Fathers. S. Clement of Rome, 2 vols. 1890.
Dissertations on the Apostolic Age. 1892.
Apostolic Fathers. Pt. II. S. Ignatius and S. Polycarp, 3 vols. 1889.
LOOFS—Nestorius and his place in the History of Christian Doctrine. Cambridge, 1914.
Nestoriana.
What is the truth about Jesus Christ ? Edinburgh, 1913.

MACLEAN & BROWN—The Catholics of the East and his people. London, 1892.
MCNABB, V. (ED.)—The Decrees of the Vatican Council.
MALTZEW, ALEXIS V.—Menologion. 1894–1908.
MANSI—Sacrorum Conciliorum Collectio. 1761.
MARINI—Il primato di S. Pietro e de' Suoi Successori in San Giovanni Cristomo. Roma, 1922.
MAYCOCK—The Papacy. London, 1927.
MICHEL, P.—L'Orient et les deux Lettres Apostoliques Praeclara Gratulationis et Orientalium dignitas Ecclesiarum.
La Question Religieuse en Orient et l'Union des Eglises. Paris, 1893.
MIGNE—Patrologia Latina.
Patrologia Graeca.
MIRBT, C.—Quellen zur Geschichte des Papsttums (3rd Edition).
MONCEAUX, PAUL—S. Cyprien. Paris, 1914.
MONTAUT, L.—Questions historiques se rapportant à saint Grégoire de Nazianze. Paris, 1878.
MOSHEIM—Ecclesiastical History, 6 vols. London, 1823.

NAU, F.—Nestorius d'après les Sources Orientales. Paris, 1911.
NESTORIUS—Le Livre d'Héraclide de Damas. Traduction par F. Nau. Paris, 1910.
NEWMAN, J. H.—Arians of the Fourth Century. London.
Development of Christian Doctrine.
Historical Sketches (Art. Theodoret).
Tracts Theological and Ecclesiastical.
NILLES—Kalendarium Manuale utriusque Ecclesiae, 2 vols. Oeniponte, 1896.

OMAN—The Byzantine Empire. London, 1892.
ORIENTALIA CHRISTIANA, 1922–1925. Rome.
OXFORD LIBRARY OF THE FATHERS.

PARGOIRE—L'Eglise Byzantine, N.D.
PISANI—A travers l'Orient.
POHLE-PREUSS—Christology. New York, 1919.
PRAT, F.—Origène, le Théologien et l'Exegète. Paris, 1907.
PULLER, F. W.—Primitive Saints and the See of Rome. 1915.

QUENET—L'unité de l'Eglise. 1924.

REGNIER, A.—St. Léon le Grand. Paris, 1920.
REVUE DE L'ORIENT CHRETIEN. 1897–1924.
REVUE D'HISTOIRE ECCLÉSIASTIQUE. Louvain.
RIVIERE, JEAN—La propagation du Christianisme dans les trois premiers siècles. Paris, 1908.
ROBERTSON, J. C.—History of the Christian Church, vols. i–v.
ROUX, A.—Le Pape Saint Gélase Ier. Paris, 1880.
RUINAUT—Le Schisme de Photius. Paris, 1910.

SALMON—Infallibility of the Church.
SCHANZ—Apology (Eng. Trans., 3 vols.).
SCOTT, S. H.—Anglo-Catholicism and Re-Union. London, 1923.
Two Articles on the Council of Ephesus in "The Antidote," New York. April and May, 1924.
General Councils and Anglican Claims. London, 1927.
SCOTT, W. L.—Eastern Catholics. London, 1924.
SOCRATES—Ecclesiastical History. Bohn.
SOLOVIEV, V.—La Russie et l'Eglise Universelle. Paris, 1922.
SOZOMEN—Ecclesiastical History. Nicene and Ante-Nicene Fathers.
SPÂCIL—Conceptus et Doctrina de Ecclesia juxta Theologiam Orientis Separati. Rome, 1923.
SPENCER JONES—England and the Holy See. London, 1902.

TIXERONT—Précis de Patrologie—Paris, 1923.
Histoire des Dogmes, 3 vols. Paris, 1912.
TOURNEBIZE—Histoire Politique et Religieuse de l'Arménie. Paris, N.D.

NOTE.—The student of the subject will find useful the articles on Leo I and Liberius in the *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*, and two recent books—*S. Grégoire le Grand*, by Mgr. Batiffol,

and *The Churches of Eastern Christendom*, by Dr. Kidd. Nor should the pioneer work of Dr. J. M. Neale—*The History of the Holy Eastern Church* (London, 1850)—be forgotten, and every student of the Russian Church should be referred to " Notes on a Visit to the Russian Church " by William Palmer (Kegan Paul, Trench & Co., 1882).

It may be mentioned that " Hefele " stands for the translation of such part of the learned bishop's monumental work on the councils as has appeared in England (ed. Clarke), while " Hefele-Leclercq " denotes the complete edition in French now being edited and revised by the erudite Benedictine of Farnborough, Dom H. Leclercq.

INDEX

Abercius of Hierapolis, Epitaph of, 43.
Abgar, K., 56, 57, 63.
Abyssinia, 64.
Acacian Schism, 211, *seq.*
Addai, 57.
—— "*Doctrine of Addai*," 57.
Agape, 69.
Agapetus, P., commemoration in Eastern liturgical books, 234.
—— consecrates Mennas, 233.
—— deposes Anthimus of Constantinople, 232.
—— dies at Constantinople, 234.
Agatho, P., a Greek, 279.
—— his claims, 280.
—— his letter to the Sixth General Council, 279.
Aggai, 58.
Akoimetai, 213.
Alexander, Bp. of Alexandria, excommunicates Arius, 75.
Allatae Sunt, 370
Anastasius, Emperor, 218
Anatolius of Constantinople, Leo's dealings with, 189, 194, 198
Anicetus, P., 42, 69
—— and Paschal Question, 44, *seq.*
Anthimus, Encyclical of Patriarch, 171, 195
—— Patriarch of Constantinople, deposed by P. Agapetus, 232
Anthony of Kiev, Metropolitan, on the papacy, 126, 129, 130
Antioch, 30
Aphraates, evidences primacy of Peter, 60
—— his "*Demonstrations*," 59, *seq.*
Apocrisiaries, 363
Apostolic Constitutions, 22
Arius, 75, 97, *seq.*, 136
Armenia, 63, *seq.*
Armenian Churches and papacy, 208
Athanasius and Council of Nicæa, 76
—— and P. Dionysius and ὁμοούσιος, 52
—— Patriarch of Alexandria, 99, *seq.*
Aurelian, Emperor, and Paul of Samosata, 52
Autocephalous Church, 64

Bardas, 318, 331, 332
Baronius on Third Canon of Constantinople, 138
Basil, Emperor, 331
—— S., and Armenia, 65
—— and the papacy, 121–123
Basiliscus, 210
Batiffol, Mgr., 6, 15
—— Early Roman Church, a "Greek" Church, 69
—— on Bp. Gore and Formula of P. Hormisdas, 222
—— on Council of Nicæa, 76
—— on Eastern Appeals to Rome, 357
—— on Irenæus, 39
—— on P. John's visit to Constantinople, 224
—— on Prof. Glubokovsky and General Councils, 72
—— on S. Basil and Rome, 123
Belisarius, 231, 236
Bigg, Dr. C., 5, 41
Bolotov, V., comments on S. Leo and Chalcedon, 192
Boris, Khan of the Bulgars, 336
Bramhall, Abp., on Peter and Rome, 376
Burkitt, F. C., on Church of Edessa, 57, *seq.*
Byzantine Church, 89, 90, 94

Caesaropapism, 93, *seq.*, 371, *seq.*
Canons of the Apostles, 23
Caspari, 43
Catacombs, 67
Cavallera, F., on Meletian Schism, 118, *seq.*
Cecropius, Bp. of Sebastopol, 204
Celestine, P., and Council of Ephesus, 146, seq.
—— considered its president, 151
—— his estimation of his prerogatives, 152, *seq.*, 166

Celestine, P., letter of Polychronius to, 79
Cerularius, Michael, 2, 310
Chapman, Dom J., on Batiffol and the Appeal of Athanasius to Constantine, 101
—— on Bp. Gore and Origen, 54
—— on Honorius, 264
—— on Leo's claims, 169
—— on S. John Chrysostom and Peter's position, 130
—— on title "œcumenical patriarch," 250
Charlemagne crowned by Pope (800), 310
Chéramy, Abbé, and present-day archæological research at S. Sébastien in Rome, 66, *seq.*
Chrysaphius, 176, 177, 180
Chrysostom, S., 34
—— and Meletius, 124
—— dealings with Rome, 133, *seq.*
—— on primacy of Peter, 125, *seq.*
Clement, Epistle of, 16, *seq.*
Clementines, 22
Constantine and Nicæa, 76, *seq.*
—— founds Constantinople, 89, *seq.*
—— his Cæsaro-papism, 90, *seq.*, 96
—— his conversion, 111
—— Pope, 287
—— Copronymus, E., and Iconoclastic controversy, 296
Constantinople, Church of, 4, 195
—— Council of, First, 138
—— —— The Third Canon of, 138
—— Dedication of city, 93
Constantius, Emperor, 110
—— —— and Athanasius on his interference in Church matters, 112
Councils, General, 2, 3 (*see also* "General Councils")
Cyprian, S., and Novatian Schism, 50
—— and re-baptism of heretics, 50
Cyprus, Church of, 64, 170
—— —— acknowledges primacy of Rome, 172
—— —— declared autocephalous, 171
—— —— founded by S. Barnabas, 170
Cyriacus, Patriarch of Constantinople, 258, 365
Cyril and Methodius, Apostles of the Slavs, 369
Cyril of Alexandria, his belief in the papacy, 148, *seq.*
—— —— on S. Peter, 155, *seq.*
—— —— opposes ambition of Juvenal of Jerusalem, 79
—— —— President of Council of Ephesus, 145, *seq.*

Dadjesu, 174
Damasus, P., and Meletius, 120
—— and S. Basil, 121–123
—— Epitaph on Peter and Paul at S. Sebastian's, Rome, 67
—— in Edict of Gratian, 137
—— Letter of S. Basil, 65
Decretum Gelasianum, 140–1
Demandatum Caelitus, 370
Diehl, Prof., on Iconoclasm, 291, 292, 293, 295
—— Prof., on Patriarch of Constantinople, 90
Diodore of Tarsus, 227
Dionysius of Alexandria, and ὁμοούσιος, 52
—— of Corinth, 22, 28, 29, 31
Dioscorus, 176
—— condemnation at Chalcedon, 191
—— presides at Latrocinium, 180
"Doctrine of Addai," 57
Döllinger, on Cyril of Alexandria, 159
—— on early papacy, 2
Domnus, 176
Downey, Dr. R., on General Councils, 73
Duchesne, 23
—— on Athanasius' Appeal to Constantine, 100
—— on Firmilian of Cæsarea, 51
—— on General Councils, 354
—— on Greek autonomy, 368
—— on Irenæus, 41
—— on passing of Rome from under dependence on Byzantium, 310
—— on Patriarch Ignatius, 338
—— on Victor, 48
—— Summary of first three centuries regarding primacy, 70

Eastern dislike of Westerns, 367
—— influences in the West, 360 *seq.*
—— popes, 69, 336
Ecthesis, The, 269, *seq.*
Edessa, 46, 56, 57, 63, 65
Eleutherius, P., 36, 42
Elvira, Council of, 290
Emperor, The Byzantine, conception of his powers, 371, *seq.*
Ephesus, Council of, 74, 143, *seq.*
—— sentence of Nestorius, 153
Ephraem, the Syrian S., 58
—— writings, evidence primacy of Peter, 60, *seq.*
Erastianism, 341

Eusebius, 22, 33, 42
—— of Dorylaeum, 177, appeals to P. Leo, 183
—— of Nicomedia, 97, *seq.*, 118
—— on Victor and Paschal Question, 46, 48, 49
—— quotes the Presbyter Caius regarding the resting places of the bodies of Peter and Paul, 68
—— spread of Christianity, 56
—— the absence of Pope Sylvester from Nicæa, 81
Eusthathius of Antioch, 77, 82, 118, *seq.*
Eutherius of Tyana, opponent of Cyril
—— —— appeals to P. Sixtus III, 163
Eutyches, 176, *seq.*
—— his appeal to pope, 177
—— writes to Peter Chrysologus, 179

Feast of Orthodoxy, 309
Felix II, P., 213
Filioque, 91, 356
Firmilian, Bp. of Cæsarea, 51
Flavian of Constantinople, 176
—— —— and Eutyches, 177
—— —— and papal prerogatives, 178, *seq.*
—— —— appeals to Leo, 182, *seq.*
—— —— Empress Placidia's reference to, 188
Florentius of Sardis, 177, 205
Funk, F. X., 41

Galla Placidia, Empress, on primacy of Rome, 188
—— —— on Flavian's appeal, 188
Gelasius, P., 213, 241
—— city's unimportance ecclesiastically, 216, cf. 195
—— his epistles, 215, *seq.*
Gelasius of Cyzicus, 80
General Council of Chalcedon, 189, *seq.*
—— —— Constantinople I, 138
—— —— Constantinople II, 226, *seq.*
—— —— Constantinople III, 262, *seq.*
—— —— Ephesus, 142, *seq.*
—— —— Nicæa, 96, *seq.*
—— —— Nicæa II, 289, *seq.*
—— —— Their extreme importance, 351, *seq.*
—— Councils, Their *raison d'être*, 71, *seq.*
—— —— What makes a Council "General"? 74
Glubokovsky, Prof., and General Councils, 72
Gnostics, 35
Gore, Bp., 6
—— Early Roman Church a "Greek" Church, 69
—— on Cyril of Alexandria, 147
—— on Irenæus, 38
—— on John of Constantinople and the Formula of Pope Hormisdas, 222
—— on Origen and Peter, 53
—— on the Eastern Church and supremacy, 353
Graffiti, 68
Gratian, Edict of, 137
Greek Liturgical Offices, 13, 14, 66
Gregory I., P., and Illyricum, 336
—— and John the Faster, 255
—— and title "Œcumenical Patriarch," 249, *seq.*
—— commemorated in Eastern Liturgical books, 261
—— II, P., 294
—— III, a Syrian, 294
—— Nazianzen, 121, 138, 250
—— the Illuminator, 63
Guignebert, 7, 9

Hadrian, P., his letters to Seventh Council, 298
—— II, P., 337
—— Letter of Ignatius to, 340
Harnack, 6, 7, 12, 27, 30, 39, 40, 43, 44
—— on Cyprian, 50, 107
Headlam, Bp. A. C., 9
Hegesippus, 42
Helladius of Tarsus, opponent of Cyril, appeals to P. Sixtus III, 163
"Henoticon, The," 212
Heraclides' Book of Nestorius, 144, *seq.*
Heraclius, Emperor, 289
Herbigny, d', Bp., 40, 42
—— on Anicetus, 45
"*Hermas, Shepherd of*," 24, 25, 31
Heurtley, Prof., on letter of Nestorius to the pope, 147
Hieria, gathering at, against image-worship, 296
Hilary, afterwards pope, 187
Holtzmann, 7
Honorius, P., 264, *seq.*, 356
—— his character, 267
—— was he heretical? 264, *seq.*
Hormisdas, P., Formulary of 218, *seq.*
Hosius, Bp. of Cordova, 75
—— —— at Nicæa, 79, *seq.*

Ibas, Letter of, 228
Iconoclastic controversy, 289, *seq.*
Ignatius, S., Epistles, 25, *seq.*
—— —— *to the Romans*, 26, 30
Ignatius, Patriarch of Constantinople, 318
Innocent I and Chrysostom, 134, *seq.*
Invocation of Saints, *see* 68, 69
Illyricum, 334, *seq.*
Irenæus, 24, 75, 351, 353
—— "*Against Heresies*," 34, *seq.*
—— Victor, 46
Irene, Empress, favours the Icons, 297
—— —— summons Council, 297

Jewel, 5
John Damascene, S., and Iconoclasm, 295
—— —— on interference of State in Church, 295
—— IV, P., condemns Monothelitism, 270
—— VIII, P., his recognition of Photius, 339, 342, 343
—— of Antioch, friend of Nestorius, 163, 170-3, 176
—— —— reconciled with Cyril, 173
—— of Constantinople and Formula of Hormisdas, 221
—— the Faster, 254, *seq.*
—— —— and title "œcumenical patriarch," 255
—— Mantagouni, 209
——, P., first pope to visit Constantinople, 224
—— Talaia, 212
Julius, P., his relations with Athanasius, 102, *seq.*
Justin, Emperor, 219
Justinian, Emperor—his attestation of Roman primacy, 231, *seq.*
—— —— his dealings with P. Vigilius, 239, *seq.*
—— —— his relations with P. Agapetus, 231, *seq.*
—— —— signs *Formula of Hormisdas*, 231, *seq.*
—— —— the "Priest King," 230
—— —— "*The Three Chapters*," 227, *seq.*
Juvenal of Jerusalem and patriarchate, 79
—— at the Council of Ephesus, 166

Kattenbusch, 31, 44, 318, 333
Kidd, Dr. B. J., on Sixth Canon of Nicæa, 78

Latrocinium, 181, 245
Leo the Great and Council of Chalcedon, 189, *seq.*
—— —— and Twenty-eighth Canon, 193, *seq.*
—— —— Eastern recognition of his claims, 204
—— —— his commemoration in Eastern Liturgy, 206
Leo the Isaurian, 290
Liberius, P., 110, *seq.*, 355
—— Athanasius on, 113
—— Batiffol, on, 114
—— commemoration in Eastern Liturgical books, 116
—— his epitaph, 116
—— Newman on, 113
Lightfoot, Bp., 9, 10, 14, 15, 18, 20, 21, 27, 28, 29, 30, 33, 44, 46
—— on Pope Stephen, 50
Linus, P., 36
Loisy, 7, 8, 16
Loofs, Prof., on Nestorius, 159

Marcian, Emperor, 189, 190, 208, 210
Maris, 228
Martin, P., Eastern commemoration of, 274
—— his Lateran Council, 273
—— martyrdom, 274
Maximus, Abbot, 265, 359
—— confessor in Monothelite Controversy, 275
—— upholder of Roman claims, 275, *seq.*
Meletian Schism, 118
Meletius, 119, 137
Mennas, consecrated patriarch by Agapetus at Constantinople, 233
Merrill, Prof., E. T., *Essays in Early Church History*, 21
Michael Lacondrago, 297
Michael, "the Drunkard," Emp., 318, *seq.*
—— —— his letter to the Pope, 324
Milman, Dean, on Constantinople's dignity, 90
—— —— on Cyril of Alexandria, 152
—— —— on the Popes as owned by Easterns as successors of Peter, 376, 377
Monophysitism, 207, *seq.*
Monothelitism, 262, *seq.*, The Controversy, 275
Morin, Dom, 40
Muratorian Canon, 25

Narses, 174
Nestorius and Council of Ephesus, 144, *seq.*
—— writes to P. Celestine, 147
Nestorianism, and Peter's primacy 173, *seq.*
—— spread of, 172, *seq.*
Newman, Card., on Ignatius, 33
Nicephorus, Patriarch of Constantinople, 300, 304
Nicholas I, 319, *seq.*
—— his letter to Michael, 324, *seq.*
—— Ignatius's appeal to, 323
—— on different rites, 370
—— on Roman claims, 327
Nicæa, Acts of, 77
—— Canons VI and VII, 77
—— Council of, 71, *seq.*

"Œcumenical Patriarch," title of, 249, *seq.*, 333
Orchard, W. G.
—— on Petrine claims, 377
Origen, 24
—— Bp. Gore on, 53
—— on Peter's position, 53
—— visits Rome, 53
—— writes to P. Fabian, 53
Ormanian, Mgr., on Armenian Church, 66
Osrhroene, 56

Palut, 57
Paschal Question, 44, *seq.*
Paschasinus condemns Dioscorus, 192
—— president at Chalcedon, 191
Patriarch, 251, *seq.*
Patriarchates, 4, 59, 78, 141, 251, *seq.*
Patriarchs of Constantinople,
—— relations with the Emperors, 375
Paul, S., 22
——, intruded Patriarch of Constantinople, 272
—— of Samosata, 52
Pavlov, A., discovers Slav MS. re Twenty-eighth Canon of Chalcedon, 198
Peter Chrysologus, S., writes to Eutyches advising submission to Peter's See, 179
Philip, his speech and claims for Celestine, 154
—— papal legate at Ephesus, 153
Philippicus, E., revives Monothelitism, 287
Photius and Third Canon of Constantinople, 138
—— his ability, 316–317
—— his complaints against Roman missionaries, 332
—— his schism, 9, 315, *seq.*
—— on Emperor Aurelian and Paul of Samosata, 52
—— on Petrine prerogatives, 344, *seq.*
Pitra, Cardinal, *Hymnographie*, 13
Pius I, P., 25
Plato, Abbot, 297
Polycarp, 21, 26, 44
Polycrates, Bp. of Ephesus, 46
Pontifex Maximus, 92
Pope, The claim of the, 78
Popes who were Easterns, 69–70, 336
Puller, F. W., and Cyril of Alexandria, 158, 159
—— on *Clementines*, 23, 24
Pusey, Dr., and S. Cyril, 151, 152
Pyrrhus, Patriarch of Constantinople, 270
—— —— holds disputation with Abbot Maximus, 271

Quartodecimans, 44, *seq.*
Quini-Sext, 285

Rabbulas of Edessa, 228, *seq.*
Re-baptism of heretics, 50, *seq.*
Renan, 44
Renatus, Theodoret's, letter to, 185
Rohrbacher, 194
Roiron, F. X., on Irenæus, "*Necesse est*," 38
Roman Church, Early, a Greek Church, 30
Roman faith, 30

Sabellianism, 52, 118
—— Arius and, 75
S. Sebastian, Rome, excavations at the Church of, 66, *seq.*
Salaville, Père
—— on Armenian evidence of primacy, 359
Sardica, Canons of, 108, *seq.*
—— Council of, 108, *seq.*, 122
—— Photius and, 109
Sayce, Prof., and recent archæological evidence, 66
Serapion, Bp. of Antioch, 57
Sergius, Patriarch of Constantinople, 263
Silverius, P., banished and dies in Palmaria, 237
—— deposed, 236
Simplicius, P., 211, 213
Sixth General Council and papacy, 282, *seq.*
Slav language used in Liturgy, 369
Socrates, 77

Socrates, his evidence as to primacy, 104
—— on bishops at Nicæa, 83
—— on Council, 96
Soloviev, Vladimir, 10, 11, 23
—— —— on papacy at Chalcedon, 206
—— —— on Photius, 315
—— —— on S. John Chrysostom, 129
Sophronius, 263
—— his acknowledgment of primacy, 268
—— his fight against Monothelitism, 268
—— Patriarch of Jerusalem, 268
Soter, P., 22, 29
Sozomen, evidence for primacy, 105
—— the letter of the Eusebians, 102
Spencer Jones, on Eastern cultus of B.V.M., 362
—— Scriptural evidence of Peter's primacy, 10
Stephen of Dor, 268
—— and primacy of Rome, 269
Stephen, P., and re-baptism, 50
Sylvester, P., and Council of Nicæa, 80, *seq.*
—— in Graeco-Slav Liturgy, 85
—— pact with Gregory the Illuminator, 105
Synodical Letters, 258, 365
Synod of the Oak, 134 , 139

Tarasius, Patriarch of Constantinople, and Image-worship, 298
—— —— the divorce of Constantine VI, 299
Theodahat, K., 231
Theodora, Empress, 229, *seq.*
Theodore I, Pope, a Greek from Jerusalem, 271
Theodore, Pope, 172
Theodore of Mopsuestia, 227
—— —— his view of the Incarnation, 228
Theodore of Studium, S., and Iconoclastic controversy, 295, 304
—— his relations with Rome, 299, *seq.*
—— nephew of Abbot Plato, 297
Theodoret, 34
—— appeals to Pope Leo, 184, *seq.*
—— his episcopate restored by Leo, 186
—— on Athanasius and Julius, 104
—— the "*Three Chapters*," 227, *seq.*
Theodoric, 224
Theodosius, E., death, 189
Theodatus of Byzantium visits Rome, 54
Theotokos, the battle-cry of Ephesus, 146
"*The Three Chapters*," 227, *seq.*
"*Third Canon of Constantinople*," 138, 195
Thomas Aquinas, on Theodore of Mopsuestia, 227
Tillemont on Cyprian, 50
Timothy the Cat, 210
Timothy (Sakophakiolos), 210
Tiridates II of Armenia, 65
Tixeront "*Histoire des Dogmes*," 37
"*The Tome*" of Leo, 179, 202
Tournebize, on Armenia, 63, *seq.*
Trisagion, 210
Trullo, Council in, 23, 79
—— —— Anti-western feeling at, 286
—— —— convened by Justinian II not an œcumenical council, 284
—— —— its canons, 285
Turner, Prof. C. H., on *Decretum Gelasianum*, 140
—— on Pope Julius, 104
—— Position of Peter in N.T., 7, 11
Twenty-eighth Canon of Chalcedon, 193, *seq.*, 253
Typus, The, 272
Tyre, Council of, 99

Victor, P., 46, *seq.*
—— the Paschal Question
Vigilius, P., 230, 237, *seq.*, 356
—— his "*Constitutum*" 244
—— his "*Judicatum*," 243
—— his tergiversations, 368
—— never unorthodox, 247
—— refuses to attend the Fifth General Council, 243
—— taken to Constantinople, 239
Vincent, legate at Nicæa, 83
Vitalian, P., 278
Vitus, legate at Nicæa, 80, 83

Wilfred of York, 280

Zephyrinus, P., and consecration of Serapion of Antioch, 57
—— and Theodotus of Byzantium, 54
Zeno, Emperor, 210
—— —— his "*Henoticon*," 212

Printed by The Stanhope Press Limited, Rochester

281.9
Scott. S.H. Sco 85
The eastern churches & the
281.9 S
Sco 85
87275